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## 1AC Energy Independence Advantage

#### Despite recent increased oil and gas production, the U.S. is still a major importer of oil and lags behind in energy leadership-Offshore production is key

Perry, 13 Mark J., professor of economics at the Flint campus of the University of Michigan, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, “World’s dependence on Persian Gulf oil can’t be ignored,” 10/1, <http://www.aei.org/article/economics/worlds-dependence-on-persian-gulf-oil-cant-be-ignored/>, ALB

In spite of the boom in U.S. oil-shale production, the world has become more reliant on a handful of Gulf oil producers whose resources are more stretched than at any time since the 1970s. So it's no surprise that the price of crude oil is above $100 a barrel, and that the average price of gasoline in the United States has exceeded $3 a gallon for the past 1,000 consecutive days.¶ In August, according to the International Energy Agency, Saudi Arabia and two other Gulf producers met a near-record 17.1% of world oil demand.¶ For the U.S., which is still the world's largest oil importer, the question is whether Gulf producers have enough spare capacity to keep pumping at high levels — or raise production to compensate for losses elsewhere in the event of a sudden disruption like the one that occurred in 2005 as a result of Hurricane Katrina in the Gulf of Mexico.¶ Sky-High Gas Prices¶ Should a serious cutoff in oil production occur anywhere in the world, the price of gasoline and other petroleum products could skyrocket in the U.S.¶ Saudi Arabia is already the single largest supplier to many of the largest importing countries like China and Japan, bringing on new production to replace declining supplies from Libya, Iran and Venezuela.¶ In fact, Saudi Arabia is now taking in more than $1 billion a day in oil export revenues.¶ For the United States, the very important task of crafting a sensible and viable energy policy — one that ramps up oil and gas production — cannot be ignored. Without decisive action to open up new areas to drilling for oil and gas, both on land and offshore, there is a real danger that the drive to achieve energy security will be stopped in its tracks and serious harm could be done to our economy.¶ So it's time to pay attention — again — to the importance of having a balanced mix of energy sources. Time to recognize that clean-coal technologies and nuclear power help to power our economy. Time to remember that the availability of reliable and affordable energy is crucial to U.S. manufacturing and the creation of jobs.¶ How Fast, How Cheap?¶ The issue is not a choice between oil and gas and alternatives but, rather, what combination can be ramped up the fastest at the lowest possible cost using available technology.¶ It's clearly time for the administration to recognize the urgency, to stop the delaying and rationalizing. While the U.S. oil and gas industry has increased domestic production significantly over the past five years, the administration has watched from the sidelines, as if energy independence is just around the corner.¶ Instead, it should permit hydraulic fracturing for oil and gas on public land, opening up offshore areas in the Atlantic and eastern Gulf of Mexico to exploratory drilling, approve the Keystone XL pipeline and stop calling for additional taxes on the oil and gas industry.¶ Keep in mind that the U.S. currently consumes 19 million barrels of oil a day, of which about 10 million barrels are imported. And oil demand is projected to grow through 2020 and beyond.¶ The consequences of a sudden run-up in world oil prices are significant. One can only hope that the tightness in the global oil market will ease. If we want to avoid being held hostage to high world oil prices, we need to shift our focus away from the Persian Gulf and develop more reliable energy sources here at home.

#### **The aff causes a permanent decrease in oil prices and increase in supply because it destroys OPECs ability to rig the market-That decreases the influence of U.S. adversaries –Causes U.S. energy leadership**

Blackwill and O’Sullivan, 14 Robert D., Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy, and Meghan L., Jeane Kirkpatrick Professor of the Practice of International Affairs and Director of the Geopolitics of Energy Project at Harvard, “America’s Energy Edge: The Geopolitical Consequences of the Shale Revolution,” <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/140750/robert-d-blackwill-and-meghan-l-osullivan/americas-energy-edge>, ALB

The most dramatic possible geopolitical consequence of the North American energy boom is that the increase in U.S. and Canadian oil production could disrupt the global price of oil -- which could fall by 20 percent or more. Today, the price of oil is determined largely by the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries, which regulates production levels among its member states. When there are unexpected production disruptions, OPEC countries (primarily Saudi Arabia) try to stabilize prices by ramping up their production, which reduces the global amount of spare production capacity. When spare capacity falls below two million barrels per day, the market gets jittery, and oil prices tend to spike upward. When the market sees spare capacity rise above roughly six million barrels a day, prices tend to fall. For the past five years or so, OPEC’s members have attempted to balance the need to fill their public coffers with the need to supply enough oil to keep the global economy humming, and they have managed to keep the price of oil at around $90 to $110 per barrel.¶ As additional North American oil floods the market, OPEC’s ability to control prices will be challenged. According to projections from the U.S. Energy Information Administration, between 2012 and 2020, the United States is expected to produce more than three million barrels of new petroleum and other liquid fuels each day, mainly from light tight oil. These new volumes, plus new supplies coming on line from Iraq and elsewhere, could cause a glut in supply, which would push prices down -- especially as global oil demand shrinks due to improved efficiency or slower economic growth. In that event, OPEC could have a hard time maintaining discipline among its members, few of which are willing to curb their oil production in the face of burgeoning social demands and political uncertainty. Persistently lower prices would create shortfalls in the revenues they need to fund their expenditures.¶ If oil prices fall and stay low, every government in the world that relies on hydrocarbon revenues will find itself under stress. Countries feeling the pinch will include Indonesia and Vietnam in Asia; Kazakhstan and Russia in Eurasia; Colombia, Mexico, and Venezuela in Latin America; Angola and Nigeria in Africa; and Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia in the Middle East. These countries’ abilities to endure such fiscal setbacks vary and would depend in part on how long low prices lasted. Even with a more moderate drop in prices, the increased volume and diversity of the oil supply would benefit energy consumers worldwide. Countries that like to use their energy supplies for foreign policy purposes -- usually in ways that run counter to U.S. interests -- will see their influence shrink.

#### Offshore oil production in particular gives the U.S. permanent control over volatility in markets and makes the U.S. a leader **Weidenmier 10** Mark, adjunct scholar at AEI, 4/1, “Drill, Baby, Drill” American Enterprise Institute, [http://www.aei.org/article/energy-and-the-environment/conventional-energy/drill-baby-drill/](http://opencaselist12.paperlessdebate.com/www.aei.org/article/energy-and-the-environment/conventional-energy/drill-baby-drill/index.htm)

President Barack Obama's decision to open up portions of the U.S. coastline to offshore drilling is a move in the right direction. Proponents of offshore drilling will argue that the proposal does not go far enough, since drilling will be limited to areas south of New Jersey on the Atlantic Coast, certain sections of the Gulf of Mexico and the north coast of Alaska. Critics will argue that the decision will increase the U.S.' carbon footprint and dependency on fossil fuels and contribute to global warming. But the decision reflects reality. Fossil fuels will continue to be an important source of energy for the U.S. economy over the next several decades as global economies gradually shift to cleaner, renewable sources of energy. Increasing U.S. domestic petroleum will not likely lower world oil prices--most experts believe that U.S. oil reserves are small in relation to the rest of the world. But it will help the U.S. offset the negative economic impact of a large increase in oil prices. For example, the economies of Alaska and Texas fare much better than non-energy producing states when oil prices rise by 50% or 100%. Oil- and natural-gas-producing states experience smaller increases in unemployment and a smaller decline in non-farm employment during a peak oil shock. The reason for this is simple; the size of the energy sector expands during a period when oil prices rise while the rest of the economy shrinks. The growing energy sector helps prop up other areas in the economy by increasing the demand for goods and services in non-oil industries. The prospect for increasing domestic fossil fuel production is much brighter for natural gas than conventional oil. Hydraulic fracturing, a new technique for extracting natural gas from shale rocks, led the Potential Gas Committee to increase their estimate of American natural gas reserves by 35% over the past couple of years. A more recent private sector report argues that shale gas more than doubles America's natural gas reserves. Another possible way to increase domestic fossil fuel production is to expand drilling on the public lands where many believe there are significant oil and natural gas deposits. Some energy experts believe that there are significant pools of oil and natural gas in sections of the Gulf of Mexico or off the coast of California, areas where offshore drilling is still prohibited. The U.S. should take advantage of more offshore oil and natural gas drilling and exploration opportunities. The U.S. could probably increase its fossil fuel production by 20% or 30% over the next decade through a combination of oil and natural gas. This could create jobs and help these states better cope with future spikes in oil prices. If we do not drill offshore, it is possible that foreign countries could drill off the continental shelf for their own benefit. To the extent that the U.S. can switch from oil to natural gas as a source of energy, this will reduce carbon emissions as natural gas is a significantly cleaner fuel.

#### Two scenarios-

**First is leadership-**

The plan is key to heg-But it does NOT cause isolationism

Blackwill and O’Sullivan, 14 Robert D., Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy, and Meghan L., Jeane Kirkpatrick Professor of the Practice of International Affairs and Director of the Geopolitics of Energy Project at Harvard, “America’s Energy Edge: The Geopolitical Consequences of the Shale Revolution,” <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/140750/robert-d-blackwill-and-meghan-l-osullivan/americas-energy-edge>, ALB

The spread of shale technology across the globe will be good news for the climate.¶ A diminished reliance on energy imports should not be confused with full energy independence. But the U.S. energy windfall should help put to rest declinist thinking about the United States. Moreover, the end of U.S. dependence on overseas energy supplies -- and on the producer countries with which Washington has often had prickly relations -- will grant the United States a greater degree of freedom in pursuing its grand strategy. But the United States will remain firmly linked to globalized energy markets. Any dramatic disruption of the global oil supply, for instance, would still affect the price at the pump in the United States and derail growth. Washington will therefore maintain an interest in preserving the stability of international markets. Nowhere is that truer than in the Middle East, where vital U.S. interests -- in preventing terrorism, countering nuclear proliferation, and promoting regional security to protect allies such as Israel and ensure the flow of energy -- will endure. So will the need to police the global commons, such as the major sea-lanes through which trade in energy and other goods flows.¶ ¶ These truths remain poorly understood, however. U.S. policymakers need to start explaining to both domestic and foreign audiences that although the energy landscape is changing, U.S. national interests are not. Newfound oil and gas will not cause Washington to disengage from the world. To be sure, the United States will remain, by almost any measure, the most powerful country on the planet. Yet it will never be able to insulate itself from shocks to the global economy, and so it will remain deeply involved overseas. This message requires particular emphasis in the Middle East, given Washington’s exit from Afghanistan and Iraq and its announced pivot toward Asia.

Heg solves great power war and dampens all global violence

Brooks et al 13

Stephen G. Brooks is Associate Professor of Government at Dartmouth College, John Ikenberry is the Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University in the Department of Politics and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. He is also a Global Eminence Scholar at Kyung Hee University, William C. Wohlforth is the Daniel Webster Professor in the Department of Government at Dartmouth College, International Security, Winter 2012/2013, "Don’t Come Home, America", MIT Press Journals

Assessing the Security Benefits of Deep Engagement Even if deep engagement’s costs are far less than retrenchment advocates claim, they are not worth bearing unless they yield greater benefits. We focus here on the strategy’s major security benefits; in the next section, we take up the wider payoffs of the United States’ security role for its interests in other realms, notably the global economy—an interaction relatively unexplored by international relations scholars. A core premise of deep engagement is that it prevents the emergence of a far more dangerous global security environment. For one thing, as noted above, the United States’ overseas presence gives it the leverage to restrain partners from taking provocative action. Perhaps more important, its core alliance commitments also deter states with aspirations to regional hegemony from contemplating expansion and make its partners more secure, reducing their incentive to adopt solutions to their security problems that threaten others and thus stoke security dilemmas. The contention that engaged U.S. power dampens the baleful effects of anarchy is consistent with influential variants of realist theory. Indeed, arguably the scariest portrayal of the war-prone world that would emerge absent the “American Pacifier” is provided in the works of John Mearsheimer, who forecasts dangerous multipolar regions replete with security competition, arms races, nuclear proliferation and associated preventive war temptations, regional rivalries, and even runs at regional hegemony and full-scale great power war.72 How do retrenchment advocates, the bulk of whom are realists, discount this benefit? Their arguments are complicated, but two capture most of the variation: (1) U.S. security guarantees are not necessary to prevent dangerous rivalries and conflict in Eurasia; or (2) prevention of rivalry and conflict in Eurasia is not a U.S. interest. Each response is connected to a different theory or set of theories, which makes sense given that the whole debate hinges on a complex future counterfactual (what would happen to Eurasia’s security setting if the United States truly disengaged?). Although a certain answer is impossible, each of these responses is nonetheless a weaker argument for retrenchment than advocates acknowledge. The first response flows from defensive realism as well as other international relations theories that discount the conflict-generating potential of anarchy under contemporary conditions.73 Defensive realists maintain that the high expected costs of territorial conquest, defense dominance, and an array of policies and practices that can be used credibly to signal benign intent, mean that Eurasia’s major states could manage regional multipolarity peacefully without the American pacifier. Retrenchment would be a bet on this scholarship, particularly in regions where the kinds of stabilizers that nonrealist theories point to—such as democratic governance or dense institutional linkages—are either absent or weakly present. There are three other major bodies of scholarship, however, that might give decisionmakers pause before making this bet. First is regional expertise. Needless to say, there is no consensus on the net security effects of U.S. withdrawal. Regarding each region, there are optimists and pessimists. Few experts expect a return of intense great power competition in a post-American Europe, but many doubt European governments will pay the political costs of increased EU defense cooperation and the budgetary costs of increasing military outlays.74 The result might be a Europe that is incapable of securing itself from various threats that could be destabilizing within the region and beyond (e.g., a regional conflict akin to the 1990s Balkan wars), lacks capacity for global security missions in which U.S. leaders might want European participation, and is vulnerable to the influence of outside rising powers. What about the other parts of Eurasia where the United States has a substantial military presence? Regarding the Middle East, the balance begins to swing toward pessimists concerned that states currently backed by Washington— notably Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia—might take actions upon U.S. retrenchment that would intensify security dilemmas. And concerning East Asia, pessimism regarding the region’s prospects without the American pacifier is pronounced. Arguably the principal concern expressed by area experts is that Japan and South Korea are likely to obtain a nuclear capacity and increase their military commitments, which could stoke a destabilizing reaction from China. It is notable that during the Cold War, both South Korea and Taiwan moved to obtain a nuclear weapons capacity and were only constrained from doing so by a still-engaged United States.75 The second body of scholarship casting doubt on the bet on defensive realism’s sanguine portrayal is all of the research that undermines its conception of state preferences. Defensive realism’s optimism about what would happen if the United States retrenched is very much dependent on its particular—and highly restrictive—assumption about state preferences; once we relax this assumption, then much of its basis for optimism vanishes. Specifically, the prediction of post-American tranquility throughout Eurasia rests on the assumption that security is the only relevant state preference, with security defined narrowly in terms of protection from violent external attacks on the homeland. Under that assumption, the security problem is largely solved as soon as offense and defense are clearly distinguishable, and offense is extremely expensive relative to defense. Burgeoning research across the social and other sciences, however, undermines that core assumption: states have preferences not only for security but also for prestige, status, and other aims, and they engage in trade-offs among the various objectives.76 In addition, they define security not just in terms of territorial protection but in view of many and varied milieu goals. It follows that even states that are relatively secure may nevertheless engage in highly competitive behavior. Empirical studies show that this is indeed sometimes the case.77 In sum, a bet on a benign postretrenchment Eurasia is a bet that leaders of major countries will never allow these nonsecurity preferences to influence their strategic choices. To the degree that these bodies of scholarly knowledge have predictive leverage, U.S. retrenchment would result in a significant deterioration in the security environment in at least some of the world’s key regions. We have already mentioned the third, even more alarming body of scholarship. Offensive realism predicts that the withdrawal of the American pacifier will yield either a competitive regional multipolarity complete with associated insecurity, arms racing, crisis instability, nuclear proliferation, and the like, or bids for regional hegemony, which may be beyond the capacity of local great powers to contain (and which in any case would generate intensely competitive behavior, possibly including regional great power war). Hence it is unsurprising that retrenchment advocates are prone to focus on the second argument noted above: that avoiding wars and security dilemmas in the world’s core regions is not a U.S. national interest. Few doubt that the United States could survive the return of insecurity and conflict among Eurasian powers, but at what cost? Much of the work in this area has focused on the economic externalities of a renewed threat of insecurity and war, which we discuss below. Focusing on the pure security ramifications, there are two main reasons why decisionmakers may be rationally reluctant to run the retrenchment experiment. First, overall higher levels of conflict make the world a more dangerous place. Were Eurasia to return to higher levels of interstate military competition, one would see overall higher levels of military spending and innovation and a higher likelihood of competitive regional proxy wars and arming of client states—all of which would be concerning, in part because it would promote a faster diffusion of military power away from the United States. Greater regional insecurity could well feed proliferation cascades, as states such as Egypt, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and Saudi Arabia all might choose to create nuclear forces.78 It is unlikely that proliferation decisions by any of these actors would be the end of the game: they would likely generate pressure locally for more proliferation. Following Kenneth Waltz, many retrenchment advocates are proliferation optimists, assuming that nuclear deterrence solves the security problem.79 Usually carried out in dyadic terms, the debate over the stability of proliferation changes as the numbers go up. Proliferation optimism rests on assumptions of rationality and narrow security preferences. In social science, however, such assumptions are inevitably probabilistic. Optimists assume that most states are led by rational leaders, most will overcome organizational problems and resist the temptation to preempt before feared neighbors nuclearize, and most pursue only security and are risk averse. Confidence in such probabilistic assumptions declines if the world were to move from nine to twenty, thirty, or forty nuclear states. In addition, many of the other dangers noted by analysts who are concerned about the destabilizing effects of nuclear proliferation—including the risk of accidents and the prospects that some new nuclear powers will not have truly survivable forces—seem prone to go up as the number of nuclear powers grows.80 Moreover, the risk of “unforeseen crisis dynamics” that could spin out of control is also higher as the number of nuclear powers increases. Finally, add to these concerns the enhanced danger of nuclear leakage, and a world with overall higher levels of security competition becomes yet more worrisome. The argument that maintaining Eurasian peace is not a U.S. interest faces a second problem. On widely accepted realist assumptions, acknowledging that U.S. engagement preserves peace dramatically narrows the difference between retrenchment and deep engagement. For many supporters of retrenchment, the optimal strategy for a power such as the United States, which has attained regional hegemony and is separated from other great powers by oceans, is offshore balancing: stay over the horizon and “pass the buck” to local powers to do the dangerous work of counterbalancing any local rising power. The United States should commit to onshore balancing only when local balancing is likely to fail and a great power appears to be a credible contender for regional hegemony, as in the cases of Germany, Japan, and the Soviet Union in the midtwentieth century. The problem is that China’s rise puts the possibility of its attaining regional hegemony on the table, at least in the medium to long term. As Mearsheimer notes, “The United States will have to play a key role in countering China, because its Asian neighbors are not strong enough to do it by themselves.”81 Therefore, unless China’s rise stalls, “the United States is likely to act toward China similar to the way it behaved toward the Soviet Union during the Cold War.”82 It follows that the United States should take no action that would compromise its capacity to move to onshore balancing in the future. It will need to maintain key alliance relationships in Asia as well as the formidably expensive military capacity to intervene there. The implication is to get out of Iraq and Afghanistan, reduce the presence in Europe, and pivot to Asia— just what the United States is doing.83 In sum, the argument that U.S. security commitments are unnecessary for peace is countered by a lot of scholarship, including highly influential realist scholarship. In addition, the argument that Eurasian peace is unnecessary for U.S. security is weakened by the potential for a large number of nasty security consequences as well as the need to retain a latent onshore balancing capacity that dramatically reduces the savings retrenchment might bring. Moreover, switching between offshore and onshore balancing could well be difficult. Bringing together the thrust of many of the arguments discussed so far underlines the degree to which the case for retrenchment misses the underlying logic of the deep engagement strategy. By supplying reassurance, deterrence, and active management, the United States lowers security competition in the world’s key regions, thereby preventing the emergence of a hothouse atmosphere for growing new military capabilities. Alliance ties dissuade partners from ramping up and also provide leverage to prevent military transfers to potential rivals. On top of all this, the United States’ formidable military machine may deter entry by potential rivals. Current great power military expenditures as a percentage of GDP are at historical lows, and thus far other major powers have shied away from seeking to match top-end U.S. military capabilities. In addition, they have so far been careful to avoid attracting the “focused enmity” of the United States.84 All of the world’s most modern militaries are U.S. allies (America’s alliance system of more than sixty countries now accounts for some 80 percent of global military spending), and the gap between the U.S. military capability and that of potential rivals is by many measures growing rather than shrinking.85 In the end, therefore, deep engagement reduces security competition and does so in a way that slows the diffusion of power away from the United States. This in turn makes it easier to sustain the policy over the long term.

#### Second is climate-

#### Multiple internal links to U.S. shale gas leadership solving warming

Blackwill and O’Sullivan, 14 Robert D., Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy, and Meghan L., Jeane Kirkpatrick Professor of the Practice of International Affairs and Director of the Geopolitics of Energy Project at Harvard, “America’s Energy Edge: The Geopolitical Consequences of the Shale Revolution,” <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/140750/robert-d-blackwill-and-meghan-l-osullivan/americas-energy-edge>, ALB

¶ Finally, the shale gas revolution can enhance U.S. leadership on climate change. Natural gas emits up to 40 percent less carbon than coal, and the United States is now meeting its climate goals not thanks to bold decision-making in Washington but simply because the economics of gas have proved so much more favorable than those of coal. The resulting downward trend in U.S. carbon emissions has given Washington greater credibility in climate talks than it once had; the U.S. government should use it to assume a more forceful stance toward countries that have resisted reining in their emissions.¶ ¶ The spread of shale technology across the globe will be good news for the climate in other ways. Some environmentalists fear that the widespread replacement of coal with gas, while reducing emissions in the short term, will lessen the pressure for more far-reaching reforms. But even though shifting from coal to gas would not solve the problem of greenhouse gas emissions, it could buy enough time for the next generation of technological and policy innovations to take hold, and these innovations could cut emissions even more dramatically.

#### Climate leadership is key to solve warming

Moon, 09, Ban Ki secretary general of the United Nations, “We Can Do It”, New York Times, p. http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/26/opinion/26iht-edban.html

Every day, the critical December summit in Copenhagen grows closer. All agree that climate change is an existential threatto humankind. Yet agreement on what to do still eludes us. How can this be? The issuesare complex, affecting everything from national economies to individual lifestyles. They involve political trade-offs and commitmentsof resources no leader can undertake lightly. We could see all that at recent climate negotiations in Bangkok. Where we needed progress, we saw gridlock. Yet the elements of a deal are on the table. All we requireto put them in place is political will.We need to step back from narrow national interest and engage in frank and constructive discussion in a spirit of global common cause. In this, we can be optimistic. Meeting in London earlier this week, British Prime Minister Gordon Brown told the leaders of 17 major economies (responsible for some 80 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions) that successin Copenhagen is within reach—if theythemselves engage, and especially if they themselves go to Copenhagen to pushan agenda for change. U.S. leadership is crucial. That is why I am encouraged by the spirit of compromise shown in the bipartisan initiative announced last week by John Kerry and Lindsey Graham. Here was a pair of U.S. senators — one Republican, the other Democratic — coming together to bridge their parties’ differences to address climate change in a spirit of genuine give-and-take. We cannot afford another period where the United States stands on the sidelines. An engaged United Statescan lead the world toseal a deal to combat climate changein Copenhagen. Anindecisive or insufficiently engaged UnitedStateswill causeunnecessary — and ultimately unaffordable — delayin concrete strategies and policies to beat this looming challenge. Leaders across the globe are increasingly showing theengagement and leadership we need. Last month, President Barack Obama joined more than 100 others at a climate change summit at U.N. headquarters in New York — sending a clear message of solidarity and commitment. So did the leaders of China, Japan and South Korea, all of whom pledged to promote the development of clean energy technologies and ensure that Copenhagen is a success. Japan’s prime minister promised a 25 percent cut in greenhouse gas emissions from 1990 levels by 2020, laying down a marker for other industrialized nations. The European Union, too, has pledged to make a 30 percent reduction as part of a global agreement. Norway has announced its readiness for a 40 percent cut in emissions. Brazil has unveiled plans to substantially cut emissions from deforestation. India and China are implanting programs to curb emissions as well.

#### Warming causes extinction

**Bushnell, 10,** Dennis Chief scientist at the NASA Langley Research Center, MS in mechanical engineering, won the Lawrence A. Sperry Award, AIAA Fluid and Plasma Dynamics Award, the AIAA Dryden Lectureship, and is the recipient of many NASA Medals for outstanding Scientific Achievement and Leadership, “Conquering Climate Change,” The Futurist

¶ Carbon-dioxide levels are now greater than at any time in the past 650,000 years, according to data gathered from examining ice cores. These increases in CO2 correspond to estimates of man-made uses of fossil carbon fuels such as coal, petroleum, and natural gas. The global climate computations, as reported by the ongoing Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) studies, indicate that such man-made CO2 sources could be responsible for observed climate changes such as temperature increases, loss of ice coverage, and ocean acidification. Admittedly, the less than satisfactory state of knowledge regarding the effects of aerosol and other issues makes the global climate computations less than fully accurate, but we must take this issue very seriously.¶ I believe we should act in accordance with the precautionary principle: When an activity raises threats of harm to human health or the environment, precautionary measures become obligatory, even if some cause-and-effect relationships are not fully established scientifically. As paleontologist Peter Ward discussed in his book Under a Green Sky, several “warming events” have radically altered the life on this planet throughout geologic history. Among the most significant of these was the Permian extinction, which took place some 250 million years ago. This event resulted in a decimation of animal life, leading many scientists to refer to it as the Great Dying. The Permian extinction is thought to have been caused by a sudden increase in CO2 from Siberian volcanoes.The amount of CO2 we’re releasing into the atmosphere today, through human activity, is 100 times greater than what came out of those volcanoes.¶ During the Permian extinction, a number of chain reaction events, or “positive feedbacks,” resulted in oxygen-depleted oceans, enabling overgrowth of certain bacteria, producing copious amounts of hydrogen sulfide, making the atmosphere toxic, and decimating the ozone layer, all producing species die-off.The positive feedbacks not yet fully included in the IPCC projections include the release of the massive amounts of fossil methane, some 20 times worse than CO2 as an accelerator of warming, fossil CO2 from the tundra and oceans, reduced oceanic CO2 uptake due to higher temperatures, acidification and algae changes, changes in the earth’s ability to reflect the sun’s light back into space due to loss of glacier ice, changes in land use, and extensive water evaporation (a greenhouse gas) from temperature increases.¶ The additional effects of these feedbacks increase the projections from a 4°C–6°C temperature rise by 2100 to a10°C–12°C rise, according to some estimates. At those temperatures, beyond 2100, essentially all the ice would melt and the ocean would rise by as much as 75 meters, flooding the homes of one-third of the global population. Between now and then, ocean methane hydrate release could cause major tidal waves, and glacier melting could affect major rivers upon which a large percentage of the population depends. We’ll see increases in flooding, storms, disease, droughts, species extinctions, ocean acidification, and a litany of other impacts, all as a consequence of man-made climate change. Arctic ice melting, CO2 increases, and ocean warming are all occurring much faster than previous IPCC forecasts, so, as dire as the forecasts sound, they’re actually conservative. Pg. 7-8¶

## 1AC Econ Advantage

#### Plan boosts the economy – has immediate and long-term benefits – reduces the deficit

Mills, 12, Mark, member of the advisory council of the McCormick School of Engineering and Applied Science at Northwestern University and serves on the board of directors of the Marshall Institute, 7/9, “Could the United States Become the World’s Energy-Export Powerhouse?”, <http://www.manhattan-institute.org/pdf/press_release_pgi_01.pdf>

Unleashing 20 billion barrels of cumulative oil from Alaska’s ANWR and some currently off-limits regions of the outer continental shelf would bring over $1 trillion of net benefits to the U.S. economy. 36¶ In general, both history and recent analyses show that for every billion barrels of oil produced (or oil-equivalent in natural gas, and similar range for coal), there are about $75 billion in broad economic benefits. 37¶ A number of recent studies have explored the implications of the new hydrocarbon trajectory, should it continue unimpeded:¶ o Citi’s analysis concludes that the oil and gas extraction sector could add as many as 3.6 million net new jobs by 2020 (for North America, both direct and indirect) and shrink the deficit by 60 percent. 38¶ o Wood Mackenzie 39 finds in its scenario report for the American Petroleum Institute a cumulative $800 billion in increased revenues to governments (federal, state, local) and another 1.5 million U.S. jobs, direct and indirect, over the coming two decades.¶ o IHS Global Insight, 40 in its analysis for America’s Natural Gas Alliance, estimates that the shale gas industry alone will add more than 1 million jobs across the U.S. economy over the coming two decades and provide over $900 billion in cumulative additional federal, state, and local government tax revenues ($465 federal, $460 state and local).¶ While there are differences in assumptions and boundaries among these and similar analyses, the order-of magnitude benefits are similar and similarly impressive: millions of jobs and hundreds of billions in revenues to government coffers.¶ None of the above accounts for the economic contributions thus far from coal, nor does it countenance expanding coal production, North America’s third great hydrocarbon resource. Some 600,000 jobs are associated with the coal industry, a fuel that already contributes some $60 billion annually to the U.S. economy, not the least of which is the increasingly vital role of low-cost electricity in an information centric economy. 41¶ The U.S. uses about three BBOE of coal per year, while the world consumes about 20 BBOE of coal annually. Expanding coal exports by an amount comparable with the increase in the oil and gas sectors would add several hundred thousand more jobs and several hundred billion more dollars in cumulative tax receipts. 42¶ While expanding hydrocarbon production will require significant investment, it will be supplied by the private sector, generating benefits to the public sector, to private citizens, and to businesses. These kinds of benefits, which accrue without cost to taxpayers, come at a particularly important time, considering the current state of persistent unemployment and underemployment, the losses in net worth for many citizens, and the budget deficits in most states and the federal government.¶ Economic benefits from expanding hydrocarbon production will be felt widely given the structural and geographic diversity of hydrocarbon resources and the associated industries. In contrast to other parts of the world, benefits here won’t flow to a handful of oligarchs but will involve thousands of businesses and ripple broadly throughout the economy. ¶ Expanding hydrocarbon production may be the single most important opportunity for near-term economic growth in North America and a beneficial resetting of energy geopolitics.

#### That prevents economic collapse

Mauldin, 11, John, President of Business Marketing Group and President of Millennium Wave Advisors, LLC (MWA) which is an investment advisory firm registered with multiple states,

Business Insider, "We Need To Cut The Deficit Right Now -- And Doing It Is Going To Clobber The Economy", May 7, articles.businessinsider.com/2011-05-07/news/29964201\_1\_endgame-spain-enemies-list/4

Then there is the crisis scenario. Let’s assume we do not deal with the deficit in any meaningful way. Eventually the debt will rise to epic, Greek proportions. The bond vigilantes arise from the dead and start to push up interest rates. Interest as a percentage of government spending rises, crowding out other government expenses or increasing the debt still further.¶ Then we have a crisis. We are FORCED by the bond market to get the deficits under control, but now we are doing so in a crisis. Health care will have to be slashed by far more than it would in a more controlled scenario. Tax increases will be brutal. You think Social Security is untouchable? Not in this crisis world. Means testing and spending freezes will be the rule of the day. Military cuts will seem draconian. Our allies who depend on us for a defense shield will not be happy. Education? On the chopping block. The economy will not be Muddle Through, but Depression 2.0. Unemployment will go north of 15%.¶ What’s my basis for this? History. This movie has played over and over again in various countries in modern history. While we may be the world’s superpower, we are not immune from the laws of economic reality.¶ In such a scenario, I expect QE 3-4-5-6. Could the Fed literally monetize the debt and then “poof” it? When our backa are against the wall, don’t assume that what has been seen as normal will be the reigning paradigm.¶ Let me jump out on a real limb. I was having dinner last Monday with Christian Menegatti, the #2 economist at friend Nouriel Roubini’s economic analysis shop. We were comparing notes (imagine that), and he said their opinion is that the US has until 2015 before the bond market really calls the deficit hand. Knowing that Nouriel is seen as the ultimate bear, it makes me nervous to put out my own even more bearish analysis.¶ I think the crucial point will be reached in late 2013. If the bond market sees a serious move to control the deficit, I think they let us “skate.” Then we Muddle Through. But if not, I think we begin to see some real push-back on rates then.¶ Why so early? Because bond investors are going to be watching the slow-motion train wreck that is happening in Europe and especially Japan. It is one thing for Greece to default (which they will in one form or another, with lots of rumors flying this morning), yet another for Japan to do so. Japan is big and makes a difference. Japan could start to go as early as the middle of 2013. As I have said, Japan is a bug in search of a windshield. Whenever this happens, 2013 or a year or so later, it is going to spook the bond market. The normal indulgence that a superpower and reserve-currency country would be accorded will become much more strained. It will seemingly happen overnight. Think Lehman Brothers on steroids.¶ I think the chances we will deal with this potential crisis are about 75%. Not doing so is such a horrific outcome that I think politicians will do the right thing. See, I am an optimist. (What was it Winston Churchill said? “You can always depend on the Americans to do the right thing, after they have exhausted all the other possibilities.”)¶ And let me note that I have had some rather at-length, high-level (but very off-the-record) discussions with politicians on the right in recent weeks. More and more of them are really getting it. But as one said to me, “John, I can’t run on that platform.” And that is the reason that I give it a 25% chance that we’ll wait until a crisis hits us. If the “good guys” (my view, not yours, gentle reader – I know many of you are of the more liberal persuasion) need a real push to act correctly, we are not in good shape.¶ I totally recognize it will not be easy to fix it. It will probably mean tax increases, which will not be good for the economy. And spending cuts that will be painful. I get all the consequences. I have written about them. But the goal is to get rid of the cancer of the deficit. It could truly destroy our economic body. Sometimes, if you have cancer, you take very ugly chemicals into your body, which have very serious side effects. The prospect does not make me happy at all, but we have made bad choices as a country for decades, and now we have to pay the price.

#### The Plan is key to long-term growth

Mason, 11, Joseph, Senior Fellow, The Wharton School, Louisiana State University Endowed Chair of Banking and nationally-renowned economist, “House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources Hearing; Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs Legislative Hearing on H.R. 306, H.R. 588, S. 266 and H.R. 285”, 4/6, Lexis

Apart from national energy concerns, however, economic considerations also favor increased development of OCS energy resources. Specifically, the boost provided to local onshore economies by offshore production would be particularly welcome in the present economic climate. Similar to fiscal alternatives presently under consideration, OCS development would provide a long-run economic stimulus to the U.S. economy because the incremental output, employment, and wages provided by OCS development would be spread over many years. Unlike those policies, however, this stimulus would not require government expenditures to support that long-term growth. A. The Present State of Offshore U.S. Oil and Gas Production Despite its importance, U.S. oil and natural gas production in offshore areas is currently limited to only a few regions. At the present time, oil and gas is only actively produced off the coast of six U.S. states: Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, California, and Alaska. The Energy Information Administration (EIA) reports that Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas are the only coastal states that provide access to all or almost all of their offshore energy resources. Only two additional states--Alaska and California--are producing any offshore energy supplies. All California OCS Planning Areas and most Alaska OCS Planning Areas, however, were not open to any new facilities until the recent end of the Congressional and Presidential moratoria. The remaining 16 coastal states are not open to new production and are not presently extracting any offshore energy resources. Even without those remaining sixteen states, plus California and Alaska, the OCS is already the most important source of U.S. energy supplies. According to the MMS, "the Federal OCS is a major supplier of oil and natural gas for the domestic market, contributing more energy (oil and natural gas) for U.S. consumption than any single U.S. state or country in the world." That is, OCS production presently meets more U.S. energy demand than any other single source, including Saudi Arabia. B. Offshore Oil Production Stimulates Onshore Economies Offshore oil and gas production has a significant effect on local onshore economies as well as the national economy. There are broadly three "phases" of development that contribute to state economic growth: (1) the initial exploration and development of offshore facilities; (2) the extraction of oil and gas reserves; and (3) refining crude oil into finished petroleum products. Industries supporting those phases are most evident in the sections of the Gulf of Mexico that are currently open to offshore drilling. For example, the U.S. shipbuilding industry - based largely in the Gulf region - benefits significantly from initial offshore oil exploration efforts. Exploration and development also requires specialized exploration and drilling vessels, floating drilling rigs, and miles and miles of steel pipe, as well as highly educated and specialized labor to staff the efforts. The onshore support does not end with production. A recent report prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy indicates that the Louisiana economy is "highly dependent on a wide variety of industries that depend on offshore oil and gas production" and that offshore production supports onshore production in the chemicals, platform fabrication, drilling services, transportation, and gas processing. Fleets of helicopters and U.S.-built vessels also supply offshore facilities with a wide range of industrial and consumer goods, from industrial spare parts to groceries. As explained in Section IV.G, however, the distance between offshore facilities and onshore communities can affect the relative intensity of the local economic effects. The economic effects in the refining phase are even more diffuse than the effects for the two preceding phases. Although significant capacity is located in California, Illinois, New Jersey, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington, additional U.S. refining capacity is spread widely around the country. As a result, refinery jobs, wages, and tax revenues are even more likely to "spill over" into other areas of the country, including non-coastal states like Illinois, as those are home to many refining and chemical industries that ride the economic coattails of oil exploration and extraction. II. OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS RESERVE ESTIMATES AND THE SOURCES OF THEIR ECONOMIC BENEFITS As described in my 2009 white paper, "The Economic Contribution of Increased Offshore Oil Exploration and Production to Regional and National Economies," available at www.americanenergyalliance.org/images/aea\_offshore\_updated\_final.pdf, significant oil and gas reserves lie under the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). According to the Energy Information Administration (EIA), the OCS (including Alaskan OCS Planning Areas) contains approximately 86 billion barrels of recoverable oil and approximately 420 trillion cubic feet of recoverable natural gas. As noted by the White House, however, the OCS estimates are conservative. Of the total OCS reserves, a significant portion was unavailable to exploration until recently. Specifically, Presidential and Congressional mandates banned production from OCS Planning Areas covering approximately 18 billion barrels of recoverable oil and 77.61 trillion cubic feet of recoverable natural gas. These bans covered approximately 31 percent of the total recoverable OCS oil reserves and 25 percent of the total recoverable OCS natural gas reserves. Economic benefits of utilizing OCS reserves accrue from three primary sources: (1) exploration/platform investments; (2) production; and (3) refining. Sources (1) and (3) produce initial effects--that is, new industry expenditures--today; in contrast, source (2) produce economic effects only once production begins. The analysis therefore considers "initial" economic effects as those that flow from exploration or investments in new refining capacity and long-term economic effects as those that flow from production and ongoing refining. A. Exploration and Offshore Facility Development In contrast to other industries, the high fixed investment costs associated with offshore oil and gas production produce large initial investments that reverberate throughout the economy. Once oil or gas reserves are located, billions of additional dollars must be spent before the well produces even $1 of revenue. For example, oil exploration costs can amount to between $200,000 and $759,000 per day per site. Additional production in the U.S. will also require a costly expansion refining capacity as well. Taken together, the fixed expenditures that precede actual offshore oil and gas production can amount to billions of dollars. For example, Chevron's "Tahiti" project in the Gulf of Mexico is representative of the large investments that firms must make before production is achieved. In 2002, Chevron explored the Tahiti lease--which lies 100 miles off the U.S. coast at a depth of 4,000 feet--and found "an estimated 400 million to 500 million barrels of recoverable resources." Chevron estimates that it will take seven years to build the necessary infrastructure required to begin production at Tahiti. The firm estimates that its total development costs will amount to "$4.7 billion--before realizing $1 of return on our investment." As a typical U.S. offshore project, the Tahiti project provides a wealth of information regarding the up-front investment costs, length of investment, and lifespan of future OCS fields. As noted above, the Tahiti field is estimated to hold between 400 million and 500 million barrels of oil and oil equivalents (primarily natural gas) and is expected to require an initial fixed investment of $4.7 billion. Using the mid-point reserve estimate of 450 million barrels of oil equivalent, up-front development costs amount to approximately $10.44 per barrel of oil reserves or $1.86 per 1,000 cubic feet of natural gas reserves. These costs will be spread over 7 years, resulting in average up-front development expenditures equal to $1.49 per barrel of oil and $0.27 per 1,000 cubic feet of natural gas. Chevron also estimates that the Tahiti project will produce for "up to 30 years". Although investment and production times vary widely, the analysis that follows uses the Tahiti project numbers - an average initial investment period of seven years followed by an average production period of 30 years - as indicative of the "typical" offshore project. I will thus assume an average initial investment period of seven years followed by an average production period of 30 years. The speed of OCS development also factors into the analysis. Because most areas of the U.S. OCS have been closed to new exploration and production for almost forty years, it is unclear how quickly firms would move to develop new offshore fields. Given its large potential reserves, however, the OCS is sure to attract significant investment. Without the benefit of government data, a rough estimate suggests that annual total investment in OCS fields would be $9.09 billion per year. Those annual expenditures are expected to last, on average, the full seven years of the development phase. Additional investment in states that already support significant production - Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas - are limited. Some of the greatest benefits accrue to areas that are home to enormous - but unavailable - total reserves: California and Florida. B. Production The likely value of state recoverable oil and gas reserves are estimated using the likely lifetime revenue that could be generated by the project. In that case, average wholesale energy prices provide the information necessary to translate reserves into revenues. Taking the simple average of the EIA's latest inflation-adjusted energy price forecasts through 2030 as provided by its Annual Energy Outlook 2009, the average inflation-adjusted price of oil will be $110.64 per barrel and the average inflation-adjusted price of natural gas will be $6.83 per thousand cubic feet. At these prices, the estimated OCS reserves are worth about $13 trillion. The value of each state's available reserves are calculated as the sum of (1) its share of available OCS Planning Area oil reserves times $110.64 per barrel and (2) its share of available OCS Planning Area natural gas reserves times $6.83 per thousand cubic feet. The same method applies to the valuation of total state OCS reserves. By those estimation methods, states such as California, facing a budget crisis in the current recession, have an estimated $1.65 trillion in resources available in nearby OCS planning areas. Florida, while not facing as dire a fiscal crisis, has about $0.55 trillion in resources available in nearby OCS planning areas. Hence, a permanent relaxation of all federal OCS production moratoria would unlock more than $3.4 trillion in new production among all the coastal states. C. Investments in Incremental Refining Capacity Since U.S. refineries are presently operating near maximum capacity increased offshore oil and gas production would also spur investment in new refineries. The U.S. refining industry is presently operating at 97.9 percent of capacity and can no longer depend on excess foreign refining to meet production shortfalls arising from seasonality or repairs. In response, many large refiners are already considering refinery expansions: ConocoPhillips announced that it planned to spend $6.5 billion to $7 billion on capacity expansion at its U.S. facilities; Chevron has also considered a major refinery expansion; and while Shell is completing a $7 billion expansion and its Port Arthur, Texas refinery they are considering further expansion elsewhere. Additional refinery investments are likely to occur in the few U.S. states that already host significant U.S. refineries. This result is largely due to environmental restrictions that severely limit the placement of new refining capacity. Current capacity is primarily concentrated in California, Louisiana, and Texas. The U.S. presently has an operating refining capacity of approximately 6.287 billion barrels of crude oil per year. Conservative estimates of OCS production would add approximately 3.773 billion barrels per year, or about sixty percent of current U.S. operating refinery capacity. Because some OCS refining production would most likely substitute for foreign production, however, the analysis conservatively assumes that only one-quarter of this new OCS production necessitates additional U.S. refinery capacity. That is, I estimate that U.S. refinery demand would increase by 943.25 million barrels per year, or 15 percent of current installed capacity. Even this modest capacity increase would require substantial new investments. In response to existing capacity constraints, Shell is already increasing the capacity of its Port Arthur, Texas refinery. This expansion will take approximately two and one-half years to complete and cost $7 billion. The facility will add 325,000 barrels per day (or 118.6 million barrels per year) in new capacity, at a cost of approximately $59.02 per barrel of new annual capacity. As noted above, since tough environmental regulations effectively limit new refinery capacity to a few states, refinery investments are likely to be limited to only a few states with large existing capacity. These states can be reasonably assumed to be the same states the already have large installed refinery capacity. Hence, incremental refinery capacity will be added predominantly in states already home to large refining capacity--those with a present capacity of more than 200 million barrels per year. There are seven such states: California, Illinois, Louisiana, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington. Expected increases in offshore oil production will induce approximately $22 billion in refining capacity investments each year for two and one half years. California, Texas, and Louisiana will receive the bulk of this investment, but investments of more than $1 billion annually can be expected in Illinois, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Washington. III. INCREASED INVESTMENTS IN OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS PRODUCTION WILL CAUSE SUBSTANTIAL INCREASES IN WAGES, EMPLOYMENT, AND TAXES, AND PROFOUND EFFECTS ON COMMUNITIES THROUGHOUT THE NATION Onshore state and local economies benefit from the development of OCS reserves by providing goods and services to offshore oil and gas extraction sites. Onshore communities provide all manner of goods and services required by offshore oil and gas extraction. A variety of industries are involved in this effort: shipbuilders provide exploration vessels, permanent and movable platforms, and resupply vessels; steelworkers fashion the drilling machinery and specialized pipes required for offshore resource extraction; accountants and bankers provide financial services; and other onshore employees provide groceries, transportation, refining, and other duties. These onshore jobs, in turn, support other jobs and other industries (such as retail and hospitality establishments). The statistical approach known as an "input-output" analysis measures the economic effects associated with a particular project or economic development plan. This approach, which was pioneered by Nobel Prize winner Wassily Leontif, has been refined by the U.S. Department of Commerce. The most recent version of the Commerce Department's analysis is known as the Regional Input-Output Modelling System, or "RIMS II." The RIMS II model provides a variety of multipliers that measure how an economic development project--such as offshore drilling--would "trickle down" through the economy providing new jobs, wages, and government revenues. This analysis can be broken down into two parts: (1) a "direct" analysis measuring the benefits that arise from industries that directly supply offshore oil and gas exploration and (2) the "final" analysis that measures the direct and indirect benefits associated with offshore exploration. The RIMS II model is the standard method governmental authorities use to evaluate the benefits associated with an economic development project. According to the Commerce Department, the RIMS II model has been used to evaluate the economic effects of many projects, including: opening or closing military bases, tourist expenditures, new energy facilities, opening or closing manufacturing plants, shopping malls, sports stadiums, and new airport or port facilities. A. Opening OCS Planning Areas would Unleash More than $11 trillion in Economic Activity The broadest measure of the incremental effect of increased OCS oil and natural gas extraction is the effect on total economic output. Until OCS production begins, onshore communities will realize only the benefits associated with offshore investment. These benefits take two forms: (1) the development of the offshore facilities themselves and (2) the expansion of onshore refining capacity. These two effects, taken together, provide a rough approximation of the additional output that would be created by allowing greater access to offshore reserves. Of course, the investment expenditures and resulting output estimated above is only made to facilitate oil and gas extraction. Once extraction begins, additional economic activity continues for the lifetime of the oil and natural gas reserves. Using the total U.S. multipliers (2.2860 for refining and 2.3938 for extraction), the total increase in U.S. output from initial investment is estimated to be a total of about $0.5 trillion, or approximately $73 billion per year for the first seven years the OCS is open. For comparative purposes, a $73 billion stimulus amounts to approximately 0.5 percent of total U.S. output (GDP) per year. Increased OCS oil and gas extraction would yield approximately $5.75 trillion in new coastal state output over the lifetime of the fields. Approximating the total increase in output associated with increasing offshore resource production throughout the U.S. (including states in the interior), yields approximately $2.45 trillion in additional output. The total increase in output in the United States is estimated to total approximately $8.2 trillion or about $273 billion per year, which amounts to just over two percent of GDP. Because the OCS areas are currently unavailable, the entire amount--$8.2 trillion--is completely new output created by a simple change in policy allowing resource extraction in additional OCS Planning Areas. B. Opening OCS Planning Areas could Create Millions of New Jobs An economic expansion tied to increased OCS resource production would also create millions of new jobs both in the extraction industry and in other sectors that serve as suppliers or their employees. The annual increase in coastal state employment from initial investments in previously unavailable OCS planning areas and additional refining capacity is estimated to be 185,320 full-time jobs per year. Again, this number does not consider the spill-over effects of investment in productive capacity and refining to other U.S. states. The total increase in U.S. employment from the investment phase is approximately 271,570 full-time jobs per year. Applying the BEA multipliers to the estimated production value results in approximately 870,000 coastal state jobs in addition to the jobs created during the initial investment phase. Again, the total increase in U.S. employment in all states (including those in the interior) resulting from increased OCS production is 340,000 greater, for a total of approximately 1,190,000 jobs be sustained for the entire OCS production period. Increased investment and production in previously unavailable OCS oil and gas extraction and the ancillary industries that support the offshore industry would produce thousands of new jobs in stable and valuable industries. Among the 271,572 jobs created in the investment phase and sustained during the first seven years of the investment cycle. The majority of new positions (162,541 jobs, or 60 percent) would be created in high-skills fields, such as health care, real estate, professional services, manufacturing, administration, finance, education, the arts, information, and management. Although the largest total increase in employment in the production phase would occur (quite naturally) in the mining industry, significant numbers of jobs would be created in other industries. Again, many of these new jobs would be created in high-skills fields, representing approximately 49 percent of all new jobs and approximately 61 percent of all new non-mining jobs. C. Opening OCS Planning Areas can Release Trillions of Dollars of Wages to Workers Hit by Recession Those jobs pay wages. OCS development is estimated to yield approximately $10.7 billion in new wages in coastal states each year. OCS production would yield approximately $1.406 trillion in additional wage income to workers in coastal states over the lifetime of the fields (or $46 billion per year over 30 years). Across the U.S., the investment phase would generate approximately $15.7 billion in additional annual wages per year for the first seven years and $70 billion per year for the next thirty years, or approximately $2.1 trillion in additional wage income. BLS data suggest that all four broad industry classifications related to oil and gas extraction pay higher wages and similar jobs in other industries. Jobs in: (1) Oil and Gas Extraction, (2) Pipeline Transportation of Crude Oil, (3) Petroleum and Coal Products Manufacturing, and (4) Support Activities for Mining, typically pay higher wages than the average American job. Taking this broader measure, the average job created by increased offshore oil and gas production pays approximately 28 percent more than the average U.S. job. D. Opening OCS Planning Areas can Contribute Trillions of Dollars in Taxes and other Public Revenues to Local, State, and Federal Governments Greater output, more jobs, and higher wages translate into higher tax collections and increases in other sources of public revenues. The MMS Report to Congress suggests that public revenues derived from OCS extraction are significant--the U.S. federal government has collected more than $156 billion in lease and levy payments for OCS oil and natural gas production. Note that this amount counts only lease and royalty payments and thus does not include any sales and income taxes paid by firms or workers supported by OCS production. Conservative estimates suggest that seven years of initial annual exploration and refining investments would produce approximately $4.8 billion annually in coastal state and local tax revenue and $11.1 billion in U.S. federal tax income. Over thirty years of production, I estimate that the extraction phase of OCS development would yield approximately $561 billion ($18.7 billion per year) in coastal state and local tax revenue and approximately $1.64 trillion ($54.7 billion per year) in new U.S. federal tax income.

**US economy sustains the global economy**

**Caploe 9** David, CEO of the Singapore-incorporated American Centre for Applied Liberal Arts and Humanities in Asia., “Focus still on America to lead global recovery”, April 7, The Strait Times, lexis

IN THE aftermath of the G-20 summit, most observers seem to have missed perhaps the most crucial statement of the entire event, made by United States President Barack Obama at his pre-conference meeting with British Prime Minister Gordon Brown: 'The world has become accustomed to the US being a voracious consumer market, the engine that drives a lot of economic growth worldwide,' he said. 'If there is going to be renewed growth, it just can't be the US as the engine.' While superficially sensible, this view is deeply problematic. To begin with, it ignores the fact that the global economy has in fact been 'America-centred' for more than 60 years. Countries - China, Japan, Canada, Brazil, Korea, Mexico and so on - either sell to the US or they sell to countries that sell to the US. This system has generally been advantageous for all concerned. America gained certain historically unprecedented benefits, but the system also enabled participating countries - first in Western Europe and Japan, and later, many in the Third World - to achieve undreamt-of prosperity. At the same time, this deep inter-connection between the US and the rest of the world also explains how the collapse of a relatively small sector of the US economy - 'sub-prime' housing, logarithmically exponentialised by Wall Street's ingenious chicanery - has cascaded into the worst global economic crisis since the Great Depression. To put it simply, Mr Obama doesn't seem to understand that **there is no other engine for the world economy** - and hasn't been for the last six decades. If the US does not drive global economic growth, growth is not going to happen. Thus, US policies to deal with the current crisis are critical not just domestically, but also to the entire world. Consequently, it is a matter of global concern that the Obama administration seems to be following Japan's 'model' from the 1990s: allowing major banks to avoid declaring massive losses openly and transparently, and so perpetuating 'zombie' banks - technically alive but in reality dead. As analysts like Nobel laureates Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman have pointed out, the administration's unwillingness to confront US banks is the main reason why they are continuing their increasingly inexplicable credit freeze, thus ravaging the American and global economies. Team Obama seems reluctant to acknowledge the extent to which its policies at home are failing not just there but around the world as well. Which raises the question: If the US can't or won't or doesn't want to be the global economic engine, which country will? The obvious answer is China. But that is unrealistic for three reasons. First, China's economic health is more tied to America's than practically any other country in the world. Indeed, the reason China has so many dollars to invest everywhere - whether in US Treasury bonds or in Africa - is precisely that it has structured its own economy to complement America's. The only way China can serve as the engine of the global economy is if the US starts pulling it first. Second, the US-centred system began at a time when its domestic demand far outstripped that of the rest of the world. The fundamental source of its economic power is its ability to act as the global consumer of last resort. China, however, is a poor country, with low per capita income, even though it will soon pass Japan as the world's second largest economy. There are real possibilities for growth in China's domestic demand. But given its structure as an export-oriented economy, it is doubtful if even a successful Chinese stimulus plan can pull the rest of the world along unless and until China can start selling again to the US on a massive scale. Finally, the key 'system' issue for China - or for the European Union - in thinking about becoming the engine of the world economy - is monetary: What are the implications of having your domestic currency become the global reserve currency? This is an extremely complex issue that the US has struggled with, not always successfully, from 1959 to the present. Without going into detail, it can safely be said that though having the US dollar as the world's medium of exchange has given the US some tremendous advantages, it has also created huge problems, both for America and the global economic system. The Chinese leadership is certainly familiar with this history. It will try to avoid the yuan becoming an international medium of exchange until it feels much more confident in its ability to handle the manifold currency problems that the US has grappled with for decades. Given all this, the US will remain the engine of global economic recovery for the foreseeable future, even though other countries must certainly help. This crisis began in the US - and it is going to have to be solved there too.

**Economic collapse causes war**

**Burrows and Harris, 09,** Mathew J. Burrows is a counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC), the principal drafter of Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World, Jennifer Harris is a member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit, “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis”, The Washington Quarterly, April, http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f\_0016178\_13952.pdf

Increased Potential for Global Conflict Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nationsi n thesame period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attack and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized,particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emergenaturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. Thelack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missileflight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus onpreemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. Types of conflict that the world continuesto experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if governmentleaders deem assured access to energy resources,for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival oftheir regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopoliticalimplications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for navalbuildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup ofregional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, andcounterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer inAsia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in amoredog-eat-dog world.What Kind of World will 2025 Be? Perhaps more than lessons, history loves patterns. Despite widespread changes in the world today, there is little to suggest that the future will not resemble the past in several respects. The report asserts that, under most scenarios, the trendtoward greater diffusion of authority and power that has been ongoing for acouple of decades is likely to accelerate because of the emergence of new globalplayers, the worsening institutional deficit, potential growth in regional blocs,and enhanced strength of non-state actors and networks. The multiplicity of actors on the international scene could either strengthen the international system, by filling gaps left by aging post-World War II institutions, or could further fragment it and incapacitate international cooperation. The diversity in both type and kind of actor raises the likelihood of fragmentation occurring over the next two decades, particularly given the wide array of transnational challenges facing the international community. Because of their growing geopolitical and economic clout, the rising powers will enjoy a high degree of freedom to customize their political and economic policies rather than fully adopting Western norms. They are also likely to cherish their policy freedom to maneuver, allowing others to carry the primary burden for dealing with terrorism, climate change, proliferation, energy security, and other system maintenance issues. Existing multilateral institutions, designed for a different geopolitical order, appear too rigid and cumbersome to undertake new missions, accommodate changing memberships, and augment their resources. Nongovernmental organizations and philanthropic foundations, concentrating on specific issues, increasingly will populate the landscape but are unlikely to affect change in the absence of concerted efforts by multilateral institutions or governments. Efforts at greater inclusiveness, to reflect the emergence of the newer powers, may make it harder for international organizations to tackle transnational challenges. Respect for the dissenting views of member nations will continue to shape the agenda of organizations and limit the kinds of solutions that can be attempted. An ongoing financial crisis and prolonged recession would tilt the scales even further in the direction of a fragmented and dysfunctional international system with a heightened risk of conflict. The report concluded that the rising BRIC powers (Brazil, Russia, India, and China) seem averse to challenging the international system, as Germany and Japan did in the nineteenth and twentiethcenturies, but this of course could change if their widespread hopes for greater prosperity become frustrated and the current benefits they derive from a globalizing world turn negative.

## 1AC Plan

#### The United States federal government should substantially increase its offshore oil and natural gas development of the Earth’s oceans, including the Outer Continental Shelf.

## 1AC Solvency

#### Obama’s recent energy plan isn’t sufficient-Does nothing about the outer continental shelf. The plan is key.

Haun, 5/29 Eric, writes for *Maritime Reporter* and *Marine News* magazines, “Obamas Energy Strategy Doesn’t Go Far Enough,” <http://www.marinelink.com/news/strategy-energy-obamas370106.aspx>, ALB

Announcing its “All-of-the-Above” energy strategy today, the Obama Administration rightfully celebrates the United States’ new position as the largest global producer of energy but fails to acknowledge Federal actions that could bring even more resources to market. National Ocean Industries Association (NOIA) said today in a press announcement.¶ “NOIA shares the President’s conviction that domestic energy production, whether from wind, oil or natural gas, produce tremendous benefits for the nation. These come in the form of increased jobs, cheaper energy costs, increased manufacturing, and enhanced national energy security,” explains NOIA President Randall Luthi.¶ “Why then,” ponders Luthi, “has the Administration been content to let these tremendous gains accrue almost exclusively from private lands? Why is the Administration so content to let vast swaths of public lands remain off-limits to responsible development? Today’s report rightly points out the tremendous safety advances in offshore oil and natural gas production implemented since 2010, yet no additional acreage is under consideration for oil and natural gas development on the Outer Continental Shelf.“¶ “It is time for the Administration to step up with actions that complement the accolades it seeks for increased domestic energy production,” Luthi continued. “NOIA calls on President Obama to substantially increase the offshore acreage to be considered in the next 5-Year Leasing Plan, to expedite the permitting that will allow additional seismic surveys to move forward in the Atlantic, and to clear the regulatory hurdles that have delayed Arctic offshore energy exploration for over a decade.”¶ “It is encouraging to see that the Administration understands the benefits of increased domestic energy production. The next step is for the Federal government to maximize development of the resources on public lands, particularly offshore, securing our nation’s status as the world leader in oil and natural gas production for future generations.”

#### Finally, lifting access restrictions on federal lands is effective and provides massive amounts of oil

Griles 3 (Lisa, Deputy Secretary – Department of the Interior, “Energy Production on Federal Lands,” Hearing before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 4-30)

Mr. GRILES. America’s public lands have an abundant opportunity for exploration and development of renewable and nonrenewable energy resources. Energy reserves contained on the Department of the Interior’s onshore and offshore Federal lands are very important to meeting our current and future estimates of what it is going to take to continue to supply America’s energy demand. Estimates suggest that these lands contain approximately 68 percent of the undiscovered U.S. oil resources and 74 percent of the undiscovered natural gas resources. President Bush has developed a national energy policy that laid out a comprehensive, long-term energy strategy for America’s future. That strategy recognizes we need to raise domestic production of energy, both renewable and nonrenewable, to meet our dependence for energy. For oil and gas, the United States uses about 7 billion barrels a year, of which about 4 billion are currently imported and 3 billion are domestically produced. The President proposed to open a small portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to environmentally responsible oil and gas exploration. Now there is a new and environmentally friendly technology, similar to directional drilling, with mobile platforms, self-containing drilling units. These things will allow producers to access large energy reserves with almost no footprint on the tundra. Each day, even since I have assumed this job, our ability to minimize our effect on the environment continues to improve to where it is almost nonexistent in such areas as even in Alaska. According to the latest oil and gas assessment, ANWR is the largest untapped source of domestic production available to us. The production for ANWR would equal about 60 years of imports from Iraq. The National Energy Policy also encourages development of cleaner, more diverse portfolios of domestic renewable energy sources. The renewable policy in areas cover geothermal, wind, solar, and biomass. And it urges research on hydrogen as an alternate energy source. To advance the National Energy Policy, the Bureau of Land Management and the DOE’s National Renewable Energy Lab last week announced the release of a renewable energy report. It identifies and evaluates renewable energy resources on public lands. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit this for the record.\* This report, which has just come out, assess the potential for renewable energy on public lands. It is a very good report that we hope will allow for the private sector, after working with the various other agencies, to where can we best use renewable resource, and how do we take this assessment and put it into the land use planning that we are currently going, so that right-of-ways and understanding of what renewable resources can be done in the West can, in fact, have a better opportunity. The Department completed the first of an energy inventory this year. Now the EPCA report, which is laying here, also, Mr. Chairman, is an estimate of the undiscovered, technically recoverable oil and gas. Part one of that report covers five oil and gas basins. The second part of the report will be out later this year. Now this report, it is not—there are people who have different opinions of it. But the fact is we believe it will be a good guidance tool, as we look at where the oil and gas potential is and where we need to do land use planning. And as we update these land use plannings and do our EISs, that will help guide further the private sector, the public sector, and all stakeholders on how we can better do land use planning and develop oil and gas in a sound fashion. Also, I have laying here in front of me the two EISs that have been done on the two major coal methane basins in the United States, San Juan Basis and the Powder River Basin. Completing these reports, which are in draft, will increase and offer the opportunity for production of natural gas with coal bed methane. Now these reports are in draft and, once completed, will authorize and allow for additional exploration and development. It has taken 2 years to get these in place. It has taken 2 years to get some of these in place. This planning process that Congress has initiated under FLPMA and other statutes allows for a deliberative, conscious understanding of what the impacts are. We believe that when these are finalized, that is in fact what will occur. One of the areas which we believe that the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management is and is going to engage in is coordination with landowners. Mr. Chairman, the private sector in the oil and gas industry must be good neighbors with the ranchers in the West. The BLM is going to be addressing the issues of bonding requirements that will assure that landowners have their surface rights and their values protected. BLM is working to make the consultation process with the landowners, with the States and local governments and other Federal agencies more efficient and meaningful. But we must assure that the surface owners are protected and the values of their ranches are in fact assured. And by being good neighbors, we can do that. In the BLM land use planning process, we have priorities, ten current resource management planning areas that contain the major oil and gas reserves that are reported out in the EPCA study. Once this process is completed, then we can move forward with consideration of development of the natural gas. We are also working with the Western Governors’ Association and the Western Utilities Group. The purpose is to identify and designate right-of-way corridors on public lands. We would like to do it now as to where right-of-way corridors make sense and put those in our land use planning processes, so that when the need is truly identified, utilities, energy companies, and the public will know where they are Instead of taking two years to amend a land use plan, hopefully this will expedite and have future opportunity so that when the need is there, we can go ahead and make that investment through the private sector. It should speed up the process of right-of-way permits for both pipelines and electric transmission. Now let me switch to the offshore, the Outer Continental Shelf. It is a huge contributor to our Nation’s energy and economic security. The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, everything you have talked about so far is onshore. Mr. GRILES. That is correct. The CHAIRMAN. You now will speak to offshore. Mr. GRILES. Yes, sir, I will. Now we are keeping on schedule the holding lease sales in the areas that are available for leasing. In the past year, scheduled sales in several areas were either delayed, canceled, or put under moratoria, even though they were in the 5-year plan. It undermined certainty. It made investing, particularly in the Gulf, more risky. We have approved a 5-year oil and gas leasing program in July 2002 that calls for 20 new lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico and several other areas of the offshore, specifically in Alaska by 2007. Now our estimates indicate that these areas contain resources up to 22 billion barrels of oil and 61 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. We are also acting to raise energy production from these offshore areas by providing royalty relief on the OCS leases for new deep wells that are drilled in shallow water. These are at depths that heretofore were very and are very costly to produce from and costly to drill to. We need to encourage that exploration. These deep wells, which are greater than 15,000 feet in depth, are expected to access between 5 to 20 trillion cubic feet of natural gas and can be developed quickly due to existing infrastructure and the shallow water. We have also issued a final rule in July 2002 that allows companies to apply for a lease extension, giving them more time to analyze complex geological data that underlies salt domes. That is, where geologically salt overlays the geologically clay. And you try to do seismic, and the seismic just gets distorted. So we have extended the lease terms, so that hopefully those companies can figure out where and where to best drill. Vast resources of oil and natural gas lie, we hope, beneath these sheets of salt in the OCS in the Gulf of Mexico. But it is very difficult to get clear seismic images. We are also working to create a process of reviewing and permitting alternative energy sources on the OCS lands. We have sent legislation to Congress that would give the Minerals Management Service of the Department of the Interior clear authority to lease parts of the OCS for renewable energy. The renewables could be wind, wave, or solar energy, and related projects that are auxiliary to oil and gas development, such as offshore staging facilities and emergency medical facilities. We need this authority in order to be able to truly give the private sector what are the rules to play from and buy, so they can have certainty about where to go.

## Energy Independence Advantage Extensions

### Warming Impact Extensions

#### Warming causes extinction

**Flournoy 12**

(Citing Dr. Feng Hsu, a NASA scientist at the Goddard Space Flight Center and a technology risk assessment expert, Don Flournoy, PhD and MA from the University of Texas, Former Dean of the University College @ Ohio University, Former Associate Dean @ State University of New York and Case Institute of Technology, Project Manager for University/Industry Experiments for the NASA ACTS Satellite, Currently Professor of Telecommunications @ Scripps College of Communications @ Ohio University, Citing Dr. "Solar Power Satellites," Chapter 2: What Are the Principal Sunsat Services and Markets?, January, Springer Briefs in Space Development, Book)

In the Online Journal of Space Communication, Dr. Feng Hsu, a NASA scientist at Goddard Space Flight Center, a research center in the forefront of science of space and Earth,writes, “The evidence of global warming is alarming,” noting the potential for a catastrophic planetary climate change is real and troubling (Hsu 2010). Hsu and his NASA colleagues were engaged in monitoring and analyzing cli- mate changes on a global scale, through which they received first-hand scientific information and data relating to global warming issues, including the dynamics of polar ice cap melting. After discussing this research with colleagues who were world experts on the subject, he wrote: I now have no doubt global temperatures are rising, and that global warming is a serious problem confronting all of humanity. No matter whether these trends are due to human interference or to the cosmic cycling of our solar system, there are two basic facts that are crystal clear: (a) there is overwhelming scientific evidence showing positive correlations between the level of CO2 concentrations in Earth’s atmosphere with respect to the historical fluctuations of global temperature changes; and(b) the overwhelming majority of the world’s scientific community is in agreement about the risks of a potential catastrophic global climate change. That is, if we humans continue to ignore this problem and do noth- ing, if we continue dumping huge quantities of greenhouse gases into Earth’s biosphere, humanity will be at dire risk (Hsu 2010). As a technology risk assessment expert, Hsu says he can show with some confi- dence that the planet will face more risk doing nothing to curb its fossil-based energy addictions than it will in making a fundamental shift in its energy supply. “This,” he writes, “is because the risks of a catastrophic anthropogenic climate change can be potentially the extinction of human species, a risk that is simply too high for us to take any chances” (Hsu 2010). It was this NASA scientist’s conclusion that humankind must now embark on the next era of “sustainable energy consumption and re-supply, the most obvious source of which is the mighty energy resource of our Sun” (Hsu 2010) (Fig. 2.1).

#### Warming causes extinction

**Bushnell 10**- Chief scientist at the NASA Langley Research Center [Dennis Bushnell (MS in mechanical engineering. He won the Lawrence A. Sperry Award, AIAA Fluid and Plasma Dynamics Award, the AIAA Dryden Lectureship, and is the recipient of many NASA Medals for outstanding Scientific Achievement and Leadership.) “Conquering Climate Change,” The Futurist, May-June, 2010

Carbon-dioxide levels are now greater than at any time in the past 650,000 years, according to data gathered from examining ice cores. These increases in CO2 correspond to estimates of man-made uses of fossil carbon fuels such as coal, petroleum, and natural gas. The global climate computations, as reported by the ongoing Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) studies, indicate that such man-made CO2 sources could be responsible for observed climate changes such as temperature increases, loss of ice coverage, and ocean acidification. Admittedly, the less than satisfactory state of knowledge regarding the effects of aerosol and other issues makes the global climate computations less than fully accurate, but we must take this issue very seriously.

I believe we should act in accordance with the precautionary principle: When an activity raises threats of harm to human health or the environment, precautionary measures become obligatory, even if some cause-and-effect relationships are not fully established scientifically. As paleontologist Peter Ward discussed in his book Under a Green Sky, several “warming events” have radically altered the life on this planet throughout geologic history. Among the most significant of these was the Permian extinction, which took place some 250 million years ago. This event resulted in a decimation of animal life, leading many scientists to refer to it as the Great Dying. The Permian extinction is thought to have been caused by a sudden increase in CO2 from Siberian volcanoes.The amount of CO2 we’re releasing into the atmosphere today, through human activity, is 100 times greater than what came out of those volcanoes.

During the Permian extinction, a number of chain reaction events, or “positive feedbacks,” resulted in oxygen-depleted oceans, enabling overgrowth of certain bacteria, producing copious amounts of hydrogen sulfide, making the atmosphere toxic, and decimating the ozone layer, all producing species die-off.The positive feedbacks not yet fully included in the IPCC projections include the release of the massive amounts of fossil methane, some 20 times worse than CO2 as an accelerator of warming, fossil CO2 from the tundra and oceans, reduced oceanic CO2 uptake due to higher temperatures, acidification and algae changes, changes in the earth’s ability to reflect the sun’s light back into space due to loss of glacier ice, changes in land use, and extensive water evaporation (a greenhouse gas) from temperature increases.

The additional effects of these feedbacks increase the projections from a 4°C–6°C temperature rise by 2100 to a10°C–12°C rise, according to some estimates. At those temperatures, beyond 2100, essentially all the ice would melt and the ocean would rise by as much as 75 meters, flooding the homes of one-third of the global population. Between now and then, ocean methane hydrate release could cause major tidal waves, and glacier melting could affect major rivers upon which a large percentage of the population depends. We’ll see increases in flooding, storms, disease, droughts, species extinctions, ocean acidification, and a litany of other impacts, all as a consequence of man-made climate change. Arctic ice melting, CO2 increases, and ocean warming are all occurring much faster than previous IPCC forecasts, so, as dire as the forecasts sound, they’re actually conservative. Pg. 7-8

#### Warming results in extinction

Ahmed 2010 (Nafeez Ahmed, Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Research and Development, professor of International Relations and globalization at Brunel University and the University of Sussex, Spring/Summer 2010, “Globalizing Insecurity: The Convergence of Interdependent Ecological, Energy, and Economic Crises,” Spotlight on Security, Volume 5, Issue 2, online)

Perhaps the most notorious indicator is anthropogenic global warmings warming. The landmark 2007 Fourth Assessment Report of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) – which warned that at then-current rates of increase of fossil fuel emissions, the earth’s global average temperature would likely rise by 6°C by the end of the 21st century creating a largely uninhabitable planet – was a wake-up call to the international community.[v] Despite the pretensions of ‘climate sceptics,’ the peer-reviewed scientific literature has continued to produce evidence that the IPCC’s original scenarios were wrong – not because they were too alarmist, but on the contrary, because they were far too conservative. According to a paper in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, current CO2 emissions are worse than all six scenarios contemplated by the IPCC. This implies that the IPCC’s worst-case six-degree scenario severely underestimates the most probable climate trajectory under current rates of emissions.[vi] It is often presumed that a 2°C rise in global average temperatures under an atmospheric concentration of greenhouse gasses at 400 parts per million (ppm) constitutes a safe upper limit – beyond which further global warming couldtrigger rapid and abrupt climate changes that, in turn, could tip the whole earth climate system into a process of irreversible, runaway warming.[vii] Unfortunately, we are already well past this limit, with the level of greenhouse gasses as of mid-2005 constituting 445 ppm.[viii] Worse still, cutting-edge scientific data suggests that the safe upper limit is in fact far lower. James Hansen, director of the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, argues that the absolute upper limit for CO2 emissions is 350 ppm: “If the present overshoot of this target CO2 is not brief, there is a possibility of seeding irreversible catastrophic effects.”[ix] A wealth of scientific studies has attempted to explore the role of positive-feedback mechanisms between different climate sub-systems, the operation of which could intensify the warming process. Emissionsbeyond 350 ppm over decades are likely to lead tothe total loss of Arctic sea-ice in the summer triggering magnified absorption of sun radiation, accelerating warming; the melting of Arctic permafrost triggering massive methane injections into the atmosphere, accelerating warming; the loss of half the Amazon rainforest triggering the momentous release of billions of tonnes of stored carbon, accelerating warming; and increased microbial activity in the earth’s soil leading to further huge releases of stored carbon, accelerating warming; to name just a few. Each of these feedback sub-systems alone is sufficient by itself to lead to irreversible, catastrophic effects that could tip the whole earth climate system over the edge.[x] Recent studies now estimate that the continuation of business-as-usual would lead to global warming of three to four degrees Celsius before 2060 with multiple irreversible, catastrophic impacts; and six, even as high as eight, degrees by the end of the century – a situation endangering the survival of all life on earth.[xi]

### Prices High

**Iraqi turmoil caused a rise in oil prices**

**Economic Times, 14,** June 18, “Iraq unrest may lead to $15-20 per barrel rise in oil price in 2 months”, http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2014-06-18/news/50679172\_1\_oil-price-oil-import-bill-iraq

¶ NEW DELHI: Exporters body [FIEO](http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/topic/FIEO) today said the unabated turmoil in Iraq may lead to a **spike in oil prices** by $ 15 to 20 a barrel in the next couple of months, adding to [inflation](http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/topic/inflation)woes and jacking up India's oil import bill.¶ India imports about 25 million tonnes of oil from Iraq each year. Militants pressing a major offensive in Iraq attacked Iraq's biggest oil refinery today, pushing up Brent for August settlement to about $ 113.60 a barrel on the London-based ICE Futures Europe exchange.¶ http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/images/pixel.gif¶ "If war-like situation in Iraq continues then it may push the oil price up by $ 15-20 per barrel in next couple of months. The crude prices have already touched $ 113 per barrel which may add to an additional $ 4-5 billion on oil imports besides pushing inflation," [Federation of Indian Exports Organisations](http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/topic/Federation%20of%20Indian%20Exports%20Organisations) (FIEO) President M Rafeeque Ahmed said.¶ India's bilateral trade with Iraq stood at $ 19.4 billion with imports contributing to $ 18.5 billion while exports were $ 0.9 billion in 2013-14. India's exports to the West Asian nation consists mainly cereals, machinery, iron & steel, pharma, meat products and ceramics.¶ The government announced host of measures yesterday to tame inflation, which soared to a five-month high of 6.01 per cent in May.¶ The exports (to Iraq) have already suffered a decline of 28 per cent in 2013-14 as compared to 2012-13 primarily on account of drop in export of iron & steel, sugar and petroleum products, FIEO said.¶ Iraq is the second-biggest oil exporter in the 12-nation [Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries](http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/topic/Organization%20of%20Petroleum%20Exporting%20Countries) ([OPEC](http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/topic/OPEC)) bloc after Saudi Arabia.

**Prices are on the rise**

**Forbes, 14, “**Oil And Gold Prices Surge As Tensions In Iraq Escalate”, http://www.forbes.com/sites/maggiemcgrath/2014/06/19/oil-and-gold-prices-surge-as-tensions-in-iraq-escalate/

¶ Stateside, oil’s increases paired with the impending summer months and summer travel in the U.S. to send prices at the pump for a surge of their own. The national average for one gallon of gas in the U.S. is $3.68, up from $3.60 a gallon this time last year and the highest levels consumers have seen at the pump in June since 2008.¶ “Oil is the lifeblood of a modern economy. Estimates vary, but each $10 increase per barrel can knock off about 0.2% from economic growth,” Brad McMillan, chief investment officer for Commonwealth Financial Network, said in a note Thursday. “With U.S. growth currently expected to fall in the 3-percent range, this is significant. Oil prices have risen by about $3 over the last month, and they could be headed higher as the conflict worsens.”¶ The reason for the price surge in the wake of violence in Iraq is that the country produces a not-insignificant amount of oil, and if Iraqi oil fields are taken over and closed, global oil supply could shrink and send prices even higher. The Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) recently projected that Iraq would be accountable for 3 million barrels of oil production a day for the second half of 2014, ranking the country as OPEC’s second-largest producer. The somewhat good news is that most of Iraq’s production occurs in the southern part of the country, and with the exception of the Baiji refinery (115 miles outside of Baghdad) — which Iraqi officials say they do have control over — ISIS has not ventured in this territory.

### Solves Heg-A2 Alt Causes

#### Solves heg EVEN IF the plan doesn’t overcome alt causes

Blackwill and O’Sullivan, 14 Robert D., Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy, and Meghan L., Jeane Kirkpatrick Professor of the Practice of International Affairs and Director of the Geopolitics of Energy Project at Harvard, “America’s Energy Edge: The Geopolitical Consequences of the Shale Revolution,” <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/140750/robert-d-blackwill-and-meghan-l-osullivan/americas-energy-edge>, ALB

The United States, meanwhile, will be uniquely positioned to profit from the shift and seize new opportunities. The energy boom will add fuel to the country’s economic revitalization, and the reduction of its dependence on energy imports will give it some measure of greater diplomatic freedom and influence. The energy boom will not solve all the challenges facing U.S. policymakers: Washington still must manage the aftermath of more than a decade of war in Afghanistan and Iraq, its own fiscal profligacy, hyperpartisanship along the Potomac, the erosion of trust among many allies in the wake of revelations about U.S. surveillance, and the rise of China. That said, the huge boom in U.S. oil and gas production, combined with the country’s other enduring sources of military, economic, and cultural strength, should enhance U.S. global leadership in the years to come -- but only if Washington protects the sources of this newfound strength at home and takes advantage of new opportunities to protect its enduring interests abroad.

### Econ Advantage Extensions

### Econ Low

#### U.S. economic collapse coming now

ET, 14, (Interview conducted by Valentin Schmid, Epoch Times. Peter Schiff is the CEO of investment firm Euro Pacific Capital. He correctly predicted the subprime crash and the ensuing financial crisis of 2008. Peter Schiff: US Economy ‘Screwed Up,’ Stock Market a ‘Bubble’ (+Video) http://www.theepochtimes.com/n3/553225-peter-schiff-us-economy-screwed-up-stock-market-a-bubble-video/)

Epoch Times: Mr. Schiff, what’s your view on the U.S. economy at this moment? Peter Schiff: I think it’s a disaster. Very few people perceive just how big a disaster it is. Most people think the U.S. economy is recovering, maybe a bit more sluggish than they would like. People talk about a jobless recovery. But the reality is it’s not a recovery at all. We are not recovering from anything. The country is getting sicker. The U.S. economy is really all screwed up. It’s the result of mainly monetary policy, but fiscal and regulatory policies are part of the problem. I think the major part of the problem is the central bank. The central bank is basically trying to accommodate bad fiscal policy, bad regulatory policy. They are trying to provide a stimulus to the economy to negate the sedative that is being applied by the government. But it’s actually making the problem worse. Epoch Times: So what’s the problem? Mr. Schiff: One of the problems we have in America is that interest rates are too low. We don’t save enough, we spend too much, we borrow too much, we don’t produce enough. So we have these huge external imbalances where we borrow from the rest of the world. We have to import goods, because we don’t invest in productivity. We are not producing the goods. But all this is done to try to maintain the illusion of health, so Americans can keep on spending. So politicians can actually pretend the economy is getting better. But all we are doing is actually covering up the symptoms. Beneath the surface, the economy is actually deteriorating. Eventually it’s going to collapse. Epoch Times: Why? Mr. Schiff: There is a limit to how much artificial stimulus we can have. There is a limit to how much money the world is willing to lend. Because once they are coming to terms with the fact that we are never going to pay the money back, they are not going to want to send us their savings and send us their production if we can’t pay for it. But we got this phony bubble economy that gets bigger and bigger. People focus on the stock market. They say, “Well the stock market is going up that must mean the economy is getting better.” No it doesn’t. There is just a lot of cash, a lot of inflation created by the central banks. So they are able to inflate a bubble in stocks or in real estate, but they are not able to generate legitimate economic growth. Epoch Times: So that’s why people feel different about the recovery? Mr. Schiff: It doesn’t feel like an economic recovery to the average American, because it’s not. We are not getting the type of prosperity that would come from real economic growth; we are just getting a bubble. And when people are speculating in the stock market, it doesn’t create real wealth. On paper for some. But we are not building factories, we are not producing more consumer goods, we are not creating good jobs, we are just inflating a bubble. And we are delaying the day of reckoning, which is relatively close at this point. Epoch Times: What does the day of reckoning look like? Mr. Schiff: Right now we are consuming what other people produce. So somebody has to do the production. The question is: Why is the world so willing to let America enjoy the fruits of their labor? When are the people producing those goods going to want to consume the goods themselves? Now right now, they are content to accept our IOUs [debt], because they figure “well we are going to spend them in the future.” They think they are building their future; they are saving dollars that they can spend in the future. Of course they don’t realize that the dollar is not going to have much value in the future, so there will be almost nothing to buy. But I also think that most of these developing economies are under the false impression that their economic growth, the success of it, lies in their ability to export—it doesn’t. The key is production. And people forget that nations don’t export just to export. They don’t export to create jobs. You export to pay for your imports. And if you are not importing anything, then there is no reason to export. Because what people want are consumer goods. So you either produce them yourself or you trade for them. But to send your consumer goods out and have nothing in return, except Treasury bonds, our trading partners aren’t benefiting. We are benefiting because we get to consume things; we did not produce anything to pay for it. Epoch Times: That can’t go on forever right? Mr. Schiff: When the world figures out that we conned them and they are holding a bunch of worthless IOUs, they are going to stop exporting. It doesn’t mean that they are going to stop producing goods. It just means that their own citizens will consume them. Which will be better for them, but that’s when the party ends in the U.S. Because without the world to supply us with the goods that we don’t produce, there is almost nothing to buy. If there is almost nothing to buy, it doesn’t matter how much money consumers will spend. There is nothing there, it’s just inflation. All our policies are about putting money in the pockets of consumers. But money doesn’t do you any good if there is almost nothing to buy. And where is this stuff coming from? It’s coming from the productive efforts of people outside of America.

**U.S. economy is on the decline**

**WSJ, 14,** May**,** “Weak Wages Pose Threat to Liftoff for Economy”, http://online.wsj.com/articles/consumer-spending-fell-0-1-in-april-1401453354

A long-awaited liftoff in the U.S. economy is facing pressure from stubbornly weak wage growth, muddying the outlook for consumers and challenging Federal Reserve policy makers who are counting on a pickup as they unwind the central bank's extraordinary support for the recovery.¶ Growth in wage and salary income slowed to just 0.2% in April from the prior month, marking the weakest monthly increase of the year, the Commerce Department said Friday. After adjusting for inflation, wage and salary income was up 2% from a year earlier. The figures came in a report showing that U.S. consumer spending fell in April for the first time in a year even while inflation crept up.¶ The weak start to the second quarter, coming after the U.S. economy in the first quarter contracted for the first time in three years, is challenging the thesis of economists and investors who have been counting on a 2014 growth breakout. Those expectations have pushed U.S. stock benchmarks to record levels, while yields on safe Treasury bonds have dipped in part due to softer economic data.

### Solvency cards

OCS drilling is key to economic growth

Mason, 9 Joseph R., Herman Moyse Jr./Louisiana Bankers Association Endowed Chair of Banking, Louisiana State University, E.J. Ourso College of Business, “The Economic Contribution of Increased Offshore Oil Exploration and Production to Regional and National Economies,” <http://www.americanenergyalliance.org/docs/images/aea_offshore_updated_final.pdf>, ALB

Until recently, Congressional and Presidential leasing moratoria have withdrawn from production oil and natural gas resources lying between 3 and 200 miles off the coast of 20 U.S. states. These moratoria have re- cently expired, however, and several policymakers have argued that the federal moratoria should be renewed. Before renewing those restrictions, however, it makes sense to take a hard look at not only the resources that are held back, but also at the total potential economic growth that will be foregone. The present study therefore estimates the total economic benefits associated with allowing natural resource production in previously unavailable Outer Continental Shelf (“OCS”) Planning Areas. The study uses data from the U.S. Commerce Department, the U.S. Department of the Interior, and the U.S. Treasury Department to estimate the total increase in output, employment, and wages in both coastal states and the entire U.S. that can be expected to result from in- creased OCS production. The estimates suggest that permanently lifting the OCS moratoria would produce broad economic benefits. Those benefits are analyzed on both short- and long-term bases. Short-run effects are represented as expected annual effects during the first years of the investment (pre-production) phase; Long-run effects are represented as expected annual effects during the production phase. A summary of the estimated short- and long-run effects is presented in Table 1. Summarizing the results, increased offshore in- vestment and production would support hundreds of thousands of new careers and provide billions of dollars in new wages and tax revenues. By the present estimates, increased production is likely to contribute an additional 0.5 percent of GDP in immediate new economic activity each year and will ultimately contribute more than 2 percent of GDP each year for thirty or more years of production. That magnitude of eco- nomic growth is expected to contribute federal and state and local tax revenue from production equivalent to approximately $350 per person over the age of eighteen per year over a similar time horizon. The total incremental contribution of increased OCS Planning Area production to GDP is more than $8 trillion (in current dollars), and total tax benefits amount to some $2.2 trillion. Total royalty revenues amount to over $400 billion. Importantly, those benefits would be realized without any increase in direct government spending. Rather, increased OCS output would refill national, state, and local government coffers—currently depleted by the real estate and credit crises—without additional government outlays. The effects of such a stimulus are particularly attractive in the face of a severe economic downturn.

#### Offshore drilling is crucial to the economy, but it’s severely underdeveloped right now-OCS solves

Mason, 9 Joseph R., Herman Moyse Jr./Louisiana Bankers Association Endowed Chair of Banking, Louisiana State University, E.J. Ourso College of Business, “The Economic Contribution of Increased Offshore Oil Exploration and Production to Regional and National Economies,” <http://www.americanenergyalliance.org/docs/images/aea_offshore_updated_final.pdf>, ALB

The Impetus for Increasing U.S. Offshore Oil Production

Maintaining energy independence by increasing U.S. offshore oil and natural gas production has long been recognized as a national imperative. In 2006, the U.S. Minerals Management Service (MMS) reported to Congress that “much of the growth in the Nation’s energy demand will have to be met by OCS…if further in- creases of imported supplies are to be avoided.” MMS also estimated that “OCS oil production could account for as much as 40 percent of domestic oil production by 2010.” Furthermore, the MMS indicated that the OCS natural gas resources would become an essential source of energy as imports from other countries — particularly Canada—decline. Apart from national energy concerns, however, economic considerations also favor increased development of OCS energy resources. Specifically, the boost provided to local onshore economies by offshore production would be particularly welcome in the present economic climate. Similar to fiscal alternatives currently being pursued, OCS development would pro- vide a long-run economic stimulus to the U.S. economy because the incremental output, employment, and wages provided by OCS development would be spread over many years. Unlike those policies, however, this stimulus would not require government expenditures to support that long-term growth.¶ A. The Current State of Offshore U.S. Oil and Gas Production¶ Despite its importance, U.S. oil and natural gas production in offshore areas is currently limited to only a few regions. At the present time, oil and gas is only¶ actively produced off the coast of six U.S. states: Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, California, and Alaska. The Energy Information Administration (EIA) reports that Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas are the only coastal states that provide access to all or almost all of their offshore energy resources. Only two additional states — Alaska and California — are producing any offshore energy sup- plies. All California OCS Planning Areas and most Alaska OCS Planning Areas, however, were not open to any new facilities until the recent end of the Congressional and Presidential moratoria. The remaining 16 coastal states are not open to new production and are not currently extracting any offshore energy resources. Even without those remaining sixteen states, plus California and Alaska, the OCS is already the most important source of U.S. energy supplies. According to the MMS, “the Federal OCS is a major supplier of oil and natural gas for the domestic market, contributing more energy (oil and natural gas) for U.S. consumption than any single U.S. state or country in the world.” That is, OCS production currently meets more U.S. energy demand than any other single source, including Saudi Arabia.

#### Offshore drilling is key to stimulate MULTIPLE SECTORS of the economy-contributes to refineries and manufacturers around the U.S.

Mason, 9 Joseph R., Herman Moyse Jr./Louisiana Bankers Association Endowed Chair of Banking, Louisiana State University, E.J. Ourso College of Business, “The Economic Contribution of Increased Offshore Oil Exploration and Production to Regional and National Economies,” <http://www.americanenergyalliance.org/docs/images/aea_offshore_updated_final.pdf>, ALB

Offshore Oil Production Stimulates Onshore Economies

Offshore oil and gas production has a significant effect on local onshore economies as well as the national economy. There are broadly three “phases” of development that contribute to state economic growth: (1) the initial exploration and development of offshore facili- ties; (2) the extraction of oil and gas resources; and (3) refining crude oil into finished petroleum products. Industries supporting those phases are most evident in the sections of the Gulf of Mexico that are currently open to offshore drilling. For example, the U.S. shipbuilding industry — based largely in the Gulf region – benefits significantly from initial offshore oil exploration efforts. Exploration and development also requires specialized exploration and drilling vessels, floating drilling rigs, and miles and miles of steel pipe, as well as highly educated and specialized labor to staff the efforts. The onshore support does not end with production. A recent report prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy indicates that the Louisiana economy is “highly dependent on a wide variety of industries that depend on offshore oil and gas production” and that offshore production supports onshore production in the chemicals,¶ platform fabrication, drilling services, transportation, and gas processing. Fleets of helicopters and U.S.- built vessels also supply offshore facilities with a wide range of industrial and consumer goods, from industrial spare parts to groceries. As explained in Section IV.G, however, the distance between offshore facilities and onshore communities can affect the relative intensity of the local economic effects. The economic effects in the refining phase are even more diffuse than the effects for the two preceding phases. Although significant capacity is located in California, Illinois, New Jersey, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington, additional U.S. refining capacity is spread widely around the country. As a result, refinery jobs, wages, and tax revenues are even more likely to extend into other areas of the country, including non-coastal states like Illinois.

#### There is a BUNCH of oil and natural gas in the OCS-That’s key to the economy, but current policy fails

Mason, 9 Joseph R., Herman Moyse Jr./Louisiana Bankers Association Endowed Chair of Banking, Louisiana State University, E.J. Ourso College of Business, “The Economic Contribution of Increased Offshore Oil Exploration and Production to Regional and National Economies,” <http://www.americanenergyalliance.org/docs/images/aea_offshore_updated_final.pdf>, ALB

A. Estimating State Offshore Oil and Gas Resources¶ Significant oil and gas resources lie under the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf. According to the EIA, the OCS (in- cluding Alaskan OCS Planning Areas) contains approximately 86 billion barrels of recoverable oil and approximately 420 trillion cubic feet of recoverable natural gas. As noted by the White House, however, the OCS estimates are conservative. Of the total OCS resources, a significant portion was unavailable to exploration until recently. Specifically, Presidential and Congressional mandates banned production from OCS Planning Areas covering approximately 18 billion barrels of recoverable oil and 77.61 trillion cubic feet of recoverable natural gas. These bans covered approximately percent of the total recoverable OCS oil resources and 25 percent of the total recoverable OCS natural gas resources. Figure 2, which was originally produced by the EIA, visually demonstrates the areas (in blue) that were previously unavailable. As noted previously, the estimated resources illustrated in Figure 2 should be considered very conservative lower bounds of recoverable energy resources. To estimate the state-by-state impact of increased oil and gas production in the OCS, the OCS Planning Area resources are apportioned to each coastal state based on the local communities that provide labor, materials, and support services for offshore production. The analysis of economic impact therefore hypothesizes that the economic benefits associated with off- shore oil and gas production accrue onshore firstly in the local communities that provide the most convenient labor, materials, and support services for offshore production. In other words, if distance is important, communities closer to the oil or gas field are more likely to provide goods and services than are communities further away. Thus, OCS Planning Area resources — and the local economic benefits associated with exploiting those resources — are apportioned by each state’s share of the ocean coastline bordering an OCS Planning Area. State coastline data is available from the Congressional Research Service (CRS). Based on this apportionment, the available and total offshore resources associated with each state are illustrated in Table 2. As previously noted, a large portion of currently unavailable resources in Figure 2 lie off the coast of states — such as California and Florida — that have been hard hit by the recent real estate crisis.

#### OCS is key to the economy

Mason, 9 Joseph R., Herman Moyse Jr./Louisiana Bankers Association Endowed Chair of Banking, Louisiana State University, E.J. Ourso College of Business, “The Economic Contribution of Increased Offshore Oil Exploration and Production to Regional and National Economies,” <http://www.americanenergyalliance.org/docs/images/aea_offshore_updated_final.pdf>, ALB

Over the life span of development, OCS planning areas will contribute approximately $8.7 trillion dollars to U.S. economic growth, of which some $2.2 trillion can be expected to be paid out in wages to em- ployees in almost 38 million annual jobs, many in high-paying professional career fields. That economic growth will also generate more than $1.6 trillion in Federal tax revenues, almost $0.6 trillion in state and local tax revenue, and $0.4 trillion in royalty revenue that will be split between federal and state governments. Those revenues will contribute to schools, health centers, and infrastructure projects that will contribute substantially to the quality of life in not only coastal regions directly affected by the development, but nationwide. Immediate revenues from exploration can also help many coastal states weather the effects of the present recession and mortgage crisis without Federal aid. While some are suggesting limiting OCS Planning Area development to areas located more than one hundred miles offshore, it is important to point out that such limitations substantially curtail the benefits of OCS development. Not only are the costs of such deep and ultradeep water development often prohibitive, but production in such areas is more volatile as a result and Federal subsidies substantially diminish the potential public revenue gains from opening OCS Planning Areas.¶ In summary, investment and development in OCS Planning Areas can increase economic growth with attendant effects on jobs, wages, taxes, and other public revenues, helping to both invigorate and stabilize economic growth while reducing oil price volatility. The resulting economic growth and public revenues are particularly attractive to local economies close to previously prohibited OCS planning areas like those off the coasts of California and Florida, which are experi encing the full force of recession and mortgage foreclosures. Jobs in these areas can be particularly powerful in resuscitating the economy and restoring economic growth. It makes no sense to consciously choose to forego such a substantial source of economic growth in a recession. In closing, a caveat. The present analysis is only meant to be a starting point for discussing the eco- nomic effects of unavailable OCS resources rather than an exact estimate of the economic effects of OCS Plan- ning Area development and operation. Clearly there will be debate about many of the parameters used in the analysis. No amount of debate, however, should detract from the simple reality that reaffirming the OCS moratoria will leave valuable economic growth opportunities on the table precisely at a time when the country owes its citizens access to jobs and wages that can help them weather the current recession.

### K2 World Econ

**Empirics prove the U.S. is key to the global economy**

**Sesit, 08**, Michael, Bloomberg News Columnist, “The four myths of economic decoupling,” The Korea Herald

Myth No. 2: The rest of the world can escape the clutches of a U.S. slowdown. Not according to history. The United States has had five recessions since 1970. Each time, other economies' GDP growth also declined. The U.S. economy fell an average of 3.8 percent during the recessions of 1974-75, 1980, 1982, 1991 and 2001, with other industrial countries slowing an average of 2 percent, Latin America falling 1.7 percent and emerging Asia declining 1.3 percent, according to the International Monetary Fund. "Despite all the chatter about one region or another being immune from problems in the United States, the reality is that in a globalized economy characterized by rising cross-border flows of goods, services and capital, only hermit economies like North Korea are truly de-linked from planet Earth," says Joseph Quinlan, New York-based chief market strategist at Bank of America Capital Management. "Every one, more or less, sinks or swims in the global village." Myth No. 3: Rising demand in the developing world will compensate for the expected drop in U.S. consumer spending.Emerging-market countries are consuming more, yet growth in many of them is still mostly driven by exports, not domestic demand. Moreover, 2.55 billion people -- almost half the population of the developing world -- lived on less than $2 a day in 2004, the latest year of available data, according to the World Bank and Bank of America. U.S. consumers spent $9.27 trillion in 2006, or 3.5 times the aggregate $2.62 trillion personal-consumption expenditure of the so-called BRIC countries: Brazil, Russia, India and China. Myth No. 4: Growing intra-Asian trade -- especially that between China and other countries in the region -- will make up for lost exports caused by a steep U.S. slowdown. No doubt, intra-regional trade is growing rapidly, but much of it reflects shipments of intermediate goods. Still, 61 percent of emerging Asia's exports are ultimately consumed in the U.S., European Union and Japan, according to the Asian Development Bank, while Asian developing countries account for just 21 percent of final demand. "The U.S. is still more important to each Asian country's total output than demand from other ex-Japan Asian economies combined," the bank said in a recent report.Myth No. 5: Europe is becoming less dependent on the United States. True, America accounts for only 12 percent of EU exports to countries outside the 25-nation bloc, down from 18 percent in 2000. But exports aren't the whole story. Sales by U.S. affiliates of German companies totaled $352 billion in 2005, the last year of available data -- four times the $86 billion of German exports to America. Meanwhile, Dutch U.S. affiliate sales were 16 times exports, U.K.-affiliate sales 7.6 times British exports and French-affiliate sales 5.9 times. "If the U.S. economy heads south, so too will the earnings of many European firms," Quinlan says. What's more, Wall Street's pull on the world's financial markets is unrivaled. "U.S. equity returns remain the single biggest driver of global equity returns," says David Woo, London-based head of global currency strategy at Barclays Capital. "A sizable U.S. equity correction, by precipitating a global equity correction, will likely lead to a synchronized global economic slowdown."

### Economy impact

**Research and empirics prove**

**Ockham Research 08**, independent research branch of Financial Market Management Inc, “Economic Turmoil Begets Geopolitical Risks”, <http://wallstreetpit.com/2008/11/economic-turmoil-begets-geopolitical-risks/>

The economic turmoil roiling world markets right now brings with it plenty of pain. Jobs are being lost, people’s savings decimated, retirement plans/goals thrown out the window, etc. Hard times bring with them harsh consequences. However, it is perhaps useful to be mindful of the geopolitical risks that accompany economic dislocation. Many analysts are eager to compare the difficulties now confronting the global economic system with those of the Great Depression. While I do not believe that the world is facing a second Great Depression, it might be worthwhile to recall from history that the Great Depression spawned geopolitical turmoil that lead to the Second World War. The incoming Obama administration—and Democratic members of Congress who talk of implementing massive defense cutbacks—may want to remember the lessons of the past as they stand on the threshold of power. The hardship and turmoil which impacted the world during the Great Depression provided fertile ground for the rise of fascist, expansionistic regimes in Germany, Italy and Japan. Hard times also precluded the Western democracies from a more muscular response in the face of growing belligerence from these countries. The United States largely turned inward during the difficult years of the 1930s. The end result was a global war of a size and scale never seen by man either before or since. Economic hardship is distracting. It can cause nations to turn their focus inward with little or no regard for rising global threats that inevitably build in tumultuous times. Authoritarian regimes invariably look for scapegoats to blame for the hardship affecting their populace. This enables them to project the anger of their citizenry away from the regime itself and onto another race, country, ideology, etc. Looking at the world today, one can certainly envision numerous potential flashpoints that could become problematic in a protracted economic downturn. Pakistan, already a hotbed of Islamic extremism and armed with atomic weapons, has been particularly hard hit by the global economic crisis. An increasingly impoverished Pakistan will be harder and harder for its new and shaky democratically-elected government to control. Should Pakistan’s economic troubles cause its political situation—always chaotic—to spin out of control, this would be a major set-back in the global war on terror. Russia, whose economy, stock markets and financial system have literally imploded over the past few months, could become increasingly problematic if faced with a protracted economic downturn. The increasingly authoritarian and aggressive Russian regime is already showing signs of anger projection. Its invasion of Georgia this summer and increasing willingness to confront the West reflect a desire to stoke the pride and anger of its people against foreign powers—particularly the United States. It is no accident that the Russians announced a willingness to deploy tactical missile systems to Kaliningrad the day after Barack Obama’s election in the U.S. This was a clear “shot across the bow” of the new administration and demonstrates Russian willingness to pursue a much more confrontational foreign policy going forward. Furthermore, the collapse in the price of oil augers poorly for Russia’s economy. The Russian budget reputedly needs oil at $70 per barrel or higher in order to be in balance. Russian foreign currency reserves, once huge have been depleted massively over the past few months by ham-fisted attempts to arrest the slide in both markets and the financial system. Bristling with nuclear weapons and nursing an ego still badly bruised by the collapse of the Soviet Union and loss of superpower status, an impoverished and unstable Russia would be a dangerous thing to behold. China too is threatened by the global economic downturn. There is no doubt that China has emerged during the past decade as a major economic power. Parts of the country have been transformed by its meteoric growth. However, in truth, only about a quarter of the nation’s billion plus inhabitants—those living in the thriving cities on the coast and in Beijing—have truly felt the impact of the economic boom. Many of these people have now seen a brutal bear market and are adjusting to economic loss and diminished future prospects. However, the vast majority of China’s population did not benefit from the economic boom and could become increasingly restive in an economic slowdown. Enough economic hardship could conceivably threaten the stability of the regime and would more than likely make China more bellicose and unpredictable in its behavior, with dangerous consequences for the U.S. and the world.

## Add-Ons

#### Plan is key to China/Russia co-op and conflict avoidance

Blackwill and O’Sullivan, 14 Robert D., Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy, and Meghan L., Jeane Kirkpatrick Professor of the Practice of International Affairs and Director of the Geopolitics of Energy Project at Harvard, “America’s Energy Edge: The Geopolitical Consequences of the Shale Revolution,” <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/140750/robert-d-blackwill-and-meghan-l-osullivan/americas-energy-edge>, ALB

Unlike energy producers, consumers should welcome the energy revolution. Increased North American production has already helped buffer markets by providing much-needed additional production during recent disruptions of exports from Libya, Nigeria, and South Sudan. Lower energy prices will be a particular boon for China and India, which are already major importers and which, according to the International Energy Agency, will see their demand for oil imports grow by 40 percent (for China) and 55 percent (for India) from 2012 to 2035. As the two countries import more energy from the Middle East and Africa, they will take ever-greater interest in these regions.¶ China also stands to benefit in another way: its relations with Russia could improve markedly. For decades, history and ideology have kept these two countries from finding common cause, despite the obvious benefits that would accrue from a closer partnership between the world’s largest energy producer and its largest consumer, which happen to share a 2,600-mile border. But as more and more North American energy comes on line, energy demand in the developed world remains flat, and demand continues to increase in the developing economies of Asia, Russia will increasingly seek to secure markets in the East. Moscow and Beijing could well move closer together on long-stalled energy deals and pipelines and collaborate more on energy issues in Central Asia. Once clinched, such arrangements could form the basis for a more extensive geopolitical relationship -- one in which China would have the upper hand.

**That’s key to the end the threat of North Korea**

**Malik**, **97**, Hafeez Prof of Political Science at Villanova University, “The Role of the United States, Russia, and China in the New World Order”

Richard Thorton’s insightful analysis of Russo-Chinese detente leads to an uncertain conclusion. … in the context of changes at national regional and global levels. Russo-Chinese cooperation could be the engine of positive, fundamental, structural change in Northeast Asia, but Russo-Chinese competition could lead to the renewal of conflict on the Korean Peninsula. Would the future of Russo-Chinese relations be riddled with counter-productive competition or be studded with constructive cooperation

**Nuclear war**

**Kim 99** Myong Chol, November 24, 1998, www.nautilus.org/for a/security/23C\_Kim.html

The long-sealed Pandora's box would be unlocked, loosing genies onto the world. The North Koreans would follow up through with their threat by announcing that they have succeeded in fabricating not only atomic bombs but hydrogen bombs small enough to be delivered by their small fleet of ICBMS. The Japanese and the Germans would decide to join the nuclear club. The East Asian tensions would be ratcheted up. The European front is quiet except for the Balkan situation, which has little possibility of flaring up into a nuclear exchange. The Mideast situation will remain still tense, but a nuclear shoot-out is a remote possibility. However, the Northeast Asian situation is quite alarming, because two million-strong armies, both armed with nuclear weapons, confront each other along the 38th Parallel in Korea in a near-war tension in the absence of a peace treaty. The first casualties in a nuclear conflagration in Korea would be South Korea and Japan, which have the world's heaviest concentration of operating nuclear power stations to serve the most booming economies on earth. The second would include the USA, Russia, and China. ICBMs fired from the USA and North Korea would cross their paths over Japan and the Pacific, joined by those launched from Russia and China.

### Piracy Add-On

**Increased oil supply through the plan solves piracy**

Blackwill and O’Sullivan, 14 Robert D., Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy, and Meghan L., Jeane Kirkpatrick Professor of the Practice of International Affairs and Director of the Geopolitics of Energy Project at Harvard, “America’s Energy Edge: The Geopolitical Consequences of the Shale Revolution,” <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/140750/robert-d-blackwill-and-meghan-l-osullivan/americas-energy-edge>, ALB

As for India and other Asian economies, the benefits will also go beyond the purely economic. A surge in the quantity of gas and oil transported through the South China Sea will provide common cause to all countries seeking to combat piracy and other risks to the free flow of energy shipments, giving China greater incentives to cooperate on security matters. At the same time, U.S. allies in East Asia, such as Japan, the Philippines, and South Korea, will have the opportunity to increase their energy imports directly from the United States and Canada. Their ability to rely on North American partners, shipping oil and LNG via shorter, more direct sea routes, should also give these countries greater peace of mind.

**Piracy causes extinction**

**The Independent, 99**, “Pirates could snatch plutonium”, <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/pirates-could-snatch-plutonium-1104109.html>)

BRITAIN is about to ship enough plutonium for more than 60 atomic bombs half way around the world in freighters vulnerable to armed attack from "nuclear pirates". Military experts say there is a real possibility that the vessels could be targeted by terrorist groups or rogue states intent on acquiring nuclear weapons. They say the guns mounted on the ships are inadequate to fend off a well orchestrated attack by pirates with superior weapons. Janes, the internationally renowned arms and naval authority, agrees. "It would not take much fire-power to knock them out," it said. The ships were "capable of repelling only a lightly armed attack" and should be protected by "at least one well-armed frigate". The shipment, which will take place in the next few months, is planned as the first of many over the next year. The number will increase sharply if ministers allow a new plutonium plant at Sellafield, the controversial Cumbrian complex, to start up. The plutonium, for power stations, is extracted from spent Japanese fuel which is reprocessed at Sellafield and at Cap la Hague, France. The prospect of such shipments has long worried security experts. Eleven years ago the US defence department said they would be "accessible and vulnerable throughout the voyage, particularly when the vessel is passing through channels, straits, and other restricted waterways, or when it is near the coast". The last plutonium shipment from Europe to Japan, in 1992, was accompanied by a specially built patrol boat operated by the Japanese Maritime Security Agency. The US, which provided the original nuclear fuel to Japan and, under a special agreement, has to approve security arrangements for shipments of plutonium extracted from it, has repeatedly promised that all of them would be accompanied by "an armed escort vessel". But it is now clear that the new shipment will not be protected by a warship. Britain, France and Japan all refuse to give details of the route or the security arrangements and will only name the ships, describe what they are carrying, and say when they are setting out, "only on one or two days before departure from Europe". US government documents show that the two freighters - the Pacific Teal and the Pacific Pintail - will each carry three 30mm guns and will be staffed by officers of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority armed with "assault rifles, shotguns and hand weapons". Paul Leventhal, director of Washington's Nuclear Control Institute, said: "Two freighters riding shotgun for each other will not repel a real-world attack." Dr Fr ank Barnaby, former director of Stockholm Peace Research Institute, said maritime hijackings were "becoming more frequent and violent" - there were 66 in the first three months of this year - and added: "The attacks are generally made at night using speedboats. This should give those responsible for the security of nuclear cargoes pause for thought." Many studies have shown that a terrorist group, let alone a rogue state, could get the plutonium from the fuel and make it into nuclear weapons. The US has approved the scaled-down security because, critics say, it does not want to antagonise France, Britain and Japan. It says the freighters count as armed escort vessels because the shipments are being carried out "on government service" by British Nuclear Fuels (BNFL), a nationalised industry. Critics say security has been lessened partly to save money and partly as a public relations exercise because using a warship escort would demonstrate vividly how dangerous the cargo is. Martin Foreward, campaign co-ordinator of Cumbrians Opposed to a Radioactive Environment, who has been monitoring the arming of the freighters at Barrow-in-Furness, said: "Once again BNFL is taking the cheap option, but this time it is putting not just Cumbria but the whole world at risk."

### TPP Add-On

Plan key to TPP

Blackwill and O’Sullivan, 14 Robert D., Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy, and Meghan L., Jeane Kirkpatrick Professor of the Practice of International Affairs and Director of the Geopolitics of Energy Project at Harvard, “America’s Energy Edge: The Geopolitical Consequences of the Shale Revolution,” <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/140750/robert-d-blackwill-and-meghan-l-osullivan/americas-energy-edge>, ALB

The energy revival is also providing U.S. trade negotiators with newfound leverage as other countries compete for access to U.S. LNG. Washington is currently negotiating two major multilateral trade deals: the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (with the 28 countries of the EU) and the Trans-Pacific Partnership (with 11 countries in the Asia-Pacific and the Americas). When it comes to LNG exports, U.S. law grants automatic approval to applications for terminals intended to ship gas to countries that have signed free-trade agreements with Washington. Applications for LNG terminals designed to send gas elsewhere, by contrast, must go through a review process that determines whether such trade is in the U.S. national interest. For the many countries in Asia and Europe that want to add U.S. natural gas imports to their energy mix, achieving this special trade status holds extra value. In fact, this incentive proved crucial in convincing Japan -- hungry for gas in the wake of the Fukushima disaster, which took its entire nuclear power infrastructure offline -- to join the talks for the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

**TPP is key to prevent South China Sea conflict**

Mendis, 13,Patrick Senior Fellow and Affiliate Professor at the School of Public Policy, George Mason University, “How Washington’s Asia pivot and the TPP can benefit Sino–American relations”, <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2013/03/06/how-washingtons-asia-pivot-and-the-tpp-can-benefit-sino-american-relations/>

But **Washington’s pivot strategy is better understood within** a new framework **of mutually assured prosperity (MAP**) — a twist on the Cold War containment practices backed by a doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD). First, at present, **strong interdependent economic relations exist** as importer–exporter, debtor–creditor and consumer–producer **between the United States and China.** This already forces the two countries to caution and resort to trade diplomacy within the WTO framework, rather than retaliatory competition or military threats to resolve differences. Second, **Sino–American trade and commercial history suggests that convergence between the two largest economies** — **intensifying indirectly and multilaterally through the TPP — may instead solidify this existing symbiotic economic relationship**. Since America’s founding, commerce has been the uniting factor among states and with foreign nations. To achieve Thomas Jefferson’s vision of an ‘Empire of Liberty,’ Alexander Hamilton devised an ingenious strategy that entailed a strong manufacturing base, a national banking system, the centralised federal government and an export-led economic and trade scheme protected by the US Navy. Similarly, Deng Xiaoping’s export-led liberalisation of Chinese economic policy also implicitly recognised the role of trade and commerce as a unifier of peoples. **There are three dimensions to the new MAP framework — geopolitics, geo-economics and geo-security —** intertwined to the extent that the lines of distinction between each are blurred. Geopolitically, **Washington’s re-engagement with the Asia Pacific after a decade of distraction is not so much a paradigm shift as the revival of a traditional and historic role.** Since the Cold War, the United States has underwritten the regional security architecture through bilateral ties with allies such as Australia, Japan, South Korea, the Philippines and Thailand. In recent **years as South China Sea tensions have intensified, Beijing’s perceived use of force in its own neighborhood causes weaker states to question the necessity of its current status as a regional hegemon, and to look for a balancer. America’s return to the Asian region reassures stakeholders that China will not overwhelm its neighbors. Economically, through trade engagement and transparency via the TPP, Washington affords smaller countries the opportunity to collectively rebalance asymmetries in bilateral trade with China without undermining China as a** valued and vital **trade partner. This simultaneously eliminates the need for naval competition, reducing the likelihood of hostile engagement over South China Sea disputes** of the so-called gunboat diplomacy sort — a term often applied to Washington’s historically preferred method of advancing foreign trade policy objectives in Asia. Meanwhile, **from a security perspective, China will be able to continue to prosper from regional stability. The expansion of Chinese military capabilities and the establishment of ports of call for PLA Navy ships will seem less threatening if the US Navy is engaged in the region in a cooperative, multilateral fashion, avoiding direct confrontation but implicitly projecting the show of force without war to restrain the adversarial behaviour. This may give China the space to ease into its role** as the dominant — **but not domineering — regional power** in a way t**hat will best serve its own economic growth and national security interests.** It is also the finest insurance policy for China that holds over $1 trillion worth of American treasury securities. Ultimately, a regional TPP-**led free trade zone** is the best ‘pacifying’ security architecture for long-term stability **between the two economic superpowers in the Pacific Ocean. The TPP will deliver benefits for individual restraint between the two power centres, and may advance regional development, encourage the integration of the Chinese economy, and allow surrounding nations to hedge their bets on** (and therefore contribute to) **China’s ‘Peaceful Rise.’** In the Asian century, alliances are complex, and multilateralism and flexibility are the new currency. **This era of Sino–American relations will require measured diplomacy.**

**SCS conflict leads to maximum escalation**

**Glaser, 12,** Bonnie S., Senior Fellow at Center for Strategic and International Studies, “Armed Clash in the South China Sea,” CFR, April, http://www.cfr.org/east-asia/armed-clash-south-china-sea/p27883

The risk of conflict in the South China Sea is significant. China, Taiwan, Vietnam, Malaysia, Brunei, and the Philippines have competing territorial and jurisdictional claims, particularly over rights to exploit the region's possibly extensive reserves of oil and gas. Freedom of navigation in the region is also a contentious issue, especially between the United States and China over the right of U.S. military vessels to operate in China's two-hundred-mile exclusive economic zone (EEZ). These tensions are shaping—and being **shaped by—rising apprehensions about** the growth of China's military power and its regional intentions. China **has embarked on a substantial modernization of its maritime paramilitary forces as well as naval capabilities** to enforce its sovereignty and jurisdiction claims by force if necessary. At the same time, it is developing capabilities that would put U.S. forces in the region at risk in a conflict, thus potentially denying access to the U.S. Navy in the western Pacific. Given the growing importance of the U.S.-China relationship, and the Asia-Pacific region more generally, to the global economy, the United States has a major interest in preventing any one of the various disputes in the South China Sea from **escalating militarily**. The Contingencies Of the many conceivable contingencies involving an armed clash in the South China Sea, three especially threaten U.S. interests and could potentially prompt the United States to use force. The **most likely** and **dangerous contingency** is a clash stemming from U.S. military operations within China's EEZ that provokes an **armed Chinese response**. The United States holds that nothing in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) or state practice negates the right of military forces of all nations to conduct military activities in EEZs without coastal state notice or consent. China insists that reconnaissance activities undertaken without prior notification and without permission of the coastal state violate Chinese domestic law and international law. China routinely intercepts U.S. reconnaissance flights conducted in its EEZ and periodically does so in **aggressive ways that increase the risk of an accident** similar to the April 2001 collision of a U.S. EP-3 reconnaissance plane and a Chinese F-8 fighter jet near Hainan Island. A comparable maritime incident could be triggered by Chinese vessels harassing a U.S. Navy surveillance ship operating in its EEZ, such as occurred in the 2009 incidents involving the USNS Impeccable and the USNS Victorious. The large growth of Chinese submarines has also **increased the danger of an incident**, such as when a Chinese submarine collided with a U.S. destroyer's towed sonar array in June 2009. Since neither U.S. reconnaissance aircraft nor ocean surveillance vessels are armed, the United States might respond to dangerous behavior by Chinese planes or ships by dispatching armed escorts. A **miscalculation** or misunderstanding could then result in a **deadly exchange of fire**, leading to further **military escalation** and precipitating a major political crisis. Rising U.S.-China mistrust and intensifying bilateral strategic competition would likely make managing such a crisis more difficult

## A2 Environment Da

#### Safeguards solve

NPC, 03, National Petroleum Council, “Balancing Natural Gas Policy – Fueling the Demands of a Growing Economy,” http://ferc.gov/industries/gas/indus-act/lng/safety/09-23-03-npc.pdf

Increase Access and Reduce Permitting Impediments to Development of

Lower-48 Natural Gas Resources Land-use policies of federal, state, and local governments have not kept pace with technological advances that allow for exploration and production while protecting environmentally sensitive areas by reducing the number and size of onshore drilling sites and offshore production facilities. In addition, the federal government has continued to set federal lands off-limits to development through legislation, executive orders, and regulatory and administrative decisions. Moreover, an increasingly complex and costly maze of statutory and regulatory requirements effectively places a significant portion of additional lands off-limits to development, even though they are technically available for leasing. The trend toward increased land restrictions and set-asides has been especially troublesome in the Rocky Mountain area. The NPC estimates that 25% of the remaining technical resource in the lower-48 underlies the Rocky Mountain area, and that 29% (70 TCF) is currently off-limits to exploration and development, either due to statutory leasing withdrawals or to the cumulative effect of conditions of approval associated with exploration and development activities. Set asides are common in the OCS, where virtually the entirety of the Atlantic and Pacific coasts are off limits due to executive order and most of the Eastern Gulf of Mexico is off limits due to administrative decisions. Most recently, further restrictions were set in place when the original boundaries of the 2001 OCS Lease Sale 181 were reduced to include only 25% of the originally proposed acreage. Experience shows that natural gas development in areas similar to those restricted in the United States can be undertaken with appropriate environmental safeguards. The use of state-of-the-art drilling and production technologies plays a key role in those developments. Mountainous areas of western Canada, which face fewer federal and provincial barriers to access, have been successfully developed without compromising the environment. The OCS of Eastern Canada is being successfully and safely developed, and the governments of British Columbia and Canada are reviewing the potential to open offshore Western Canada for exploration and development. The NPC recognizes and supports the obligations of state and federal governments to protect endangered species, historical resources, and the environment. At the same time, the NPC sees the need for government to balance those considerations with the need to increase supplies of natural gas. The following public-policy recommendations are designed to foster balance by streamlining processes, improving communications, enhancing cooperation, acknowledging proven technological advances, and reducing unnecessary costs and delays for the industry and the various government agencies and non-governmental organizations involved with addressing these issues. The recommendations are segregated into onshore and offshore.

#### Won’t harm the environment

Thornley, 09, Drew Independent policy analyst focused primarily on energy, teaches business law at Concordia University in Austin, Texas. graduated summa cum laude with a B.A. in economics from The University of Alabama in 2002 and received a J.D. from Harvard Law School in 2005, “ENERGY & ENVIRONMENTAL MYTHS”, http://www.manhattan-institute.org/energymyths/myth8.htm

Since 1975, offshore drilling in the Exclusive Economic Zone (within 200 miles of U.S. coasts) has a safety record of 99.999 percent, meaning that only 0.0001 percent of the oil produced has been spilled.[103] With regard to the Outer Continental Shelf (U.S. waters under federal, rather than state, jurisdiction),[104] between 1993 and 2007 there were 651 oil spills, releasing 47,800 barrels of oil. Given 7.5 billion barrels of oil produced during that period, one barrel of oil has been spilled in the OCS per 156,900 barrels produced.[105] Research published in 2000 by the U.S. Minerals Management Service (MMS)[106] documents the decreasing occurrence of crude-oil spills in the OCS. Revising previous estimates first published in 1994, the authors analyzed data through 1999 and concluded that oil-spill rates for OCS platforms, tankers, and barges continued to decline.[107] Additionally, the number of oil spills from platforms, tankers, and pipelines is small, relative to the amount of oil extracted and transported. Even so, oil spills remain an unpleasant reality of offshore oil drilling. Certainly, any amount of oil spilled into the ocean is undesirable, but offshore oil operations contribute relatively little of the oil that enters ocean waters each year. For example, ocean floors naturally seep more oil into the ocean than do oil-drilling accidents and oil-tanker spills combined. (However, such seepage generally does not rise to the surface or reach the coastlines and, thus, is not as apparent as oil-drilling spills.) According to the National Academies’ National Research Council, natural processes are responsible for over 60 percent of the petroleum that enters North American ocean waters and over 45 percent of the petroleum that enters ocean waters worldwide.[108] Thus, in percentage terms, North America’s oil-drilling activities spill less oil into the ocean than the global average, suggesting that our drilling is comparatively safe for the environment. Ironically, research shows that drilling can actually reduce natural seepage, as it relieves the pressure that drives oil and gas up from ocean floors and into ocean waters. In 1999, two peer-reviewed studies found that natural seepage in the northern Santa Barbara Channel was significantly reduced by oil production. The researchers documented that natural seepage declined 50 percent around Platform Holly over a twenty-two-year period, concluding that, as oil was pumped from the reservoir, the pressure that drives natural seepage dropped.[109] Offshore oil drilling is carefully monitored for environmental safety. Using state-of-the-art technology and employing a range of procedural safeguards, U.S. offshore drilling has a track record of minimal environmental impact. Modern oil drilling is even designed to withstand hurricanes and tropical storms. According to the MMS, 3,050 of the Gulf of Mexico’s 4,000 platforms and 22,000 of the 33,000 miles of the Gulf’s pipelines were in the direct path of either Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita. The hurricanes destroyed 115 drilling platforms, damaged 52 others, and damaged 535 pipeline segments, yet “there was no loss of life and no major oil spills attributed to either storm.”[110] All forms of energy production come with risks, both to humans and to the environment. Offshore oil drilling is no exception. Spills from offshore drilling and tankers undoubtedly will continue to occur, but they are rare and are decreasing in frequency; and the amount of oil spilled from rigs and tankers is small, compared with the amount of oil extracted and with the amount of oil that enters ocean waters naturally from ocean floors. As technology continues to advance, and as companies find themselves accountable to a public increasingly concerned about environmental stewardship, drilling for oil in our coastal waters will continue to be conducted in a safe and environmentally conscious manner.

#### Abandoned platforms are great marine habitats – solves population loss

Zaw, 10, Htun, Bachelor of Engineering (Mechanical) Mandalay Technological University, Master of Engineering (Professional) in Offshore Technology and Management, Asian Institute of Technology, “Offshore Oil and Gas Field Development Planning,” <http://www.set.ait.ac.th/otm/thesis2010/11.pdf>

The reuse for abandoned platforms can be utilized in some purpose. Dokken, 1993; Gardner, Wiebe, 1993 studied about an analysis of scientific potential of research stations permanently based on abandoned oil platforms in the Gulf of Mexico. The regulation of the marine populations and coral reproduction, making underwater observations, monitoring the sea level, and collecting oceanographic and meteorological information within the framework of international projects were studied. Rowe (1993) mention that transformation of abandoned platforms into places for power generation using wind/wave and thermal energy should be considered. Side (1992) suggested that platforms could be utilized as bases for search and rescue operations or centers for waste processing and disposal. From the point of view of fisheries, the project has aim to convert the marine structures into artificial reefs. Artificial reefs were widely and effectively used on the shelves of many countries to provide additional habitats for marine life. The offshore structures can attract many species. In particular, observations in the Gulf of Mexico discovered a strong positive correlation between the amount of oil platforms and commercial fish catches in the region. Positive impact of offshore oil and gas developments on the fish populations and stock are occurred.

Their authors have a personal incentive to exaggerate the impact

**Spencer, 08,** Roy climatologist and a Principal Research Scientist for the University of Alabama in Huntsville, Ph.D. in meteorology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1981, former Senior Scientist for Climate Studies at NASA’s Marshall Space Flight Center, where he and Dr. John Christy received NASA’s Exceptional Scientific Achievement Medal for their global temperature monitoring work with satellites, Climate Confusion, 2008

The media can always find an expert who is willing to provide some juicy quotes regarding our imminent environmental doom. Usually there is a grain of truth to the story which helps sell the idea. Like a science fiction novel, a somewhat plausible weather disaster tale captures our imagination, and we consider the possibility of global catastrophe. And some of the catastrophic events that are predicted are indeed possible, or at least not impossible. Catastrophic global warming—say by 10° Fahrenheit or more over the next century—cannot be ruled out with 100 percent certainty. Of course, neither can the next extraterrestrial invasion of Earth. But theoretical possibilities reported by the media are far from competent scientific predictions of the future. The bias contained in all of these gloom-and-doom news stories has a huge influence on how we perceive the health of the Earth and our effect on it. We scientists routinely encounter reporters who ignore the uncertainties we voice about global warming when they write their articles and news reports. Sometimes an article will be fairly balanced, but that is the exception. Few reporters are willing to push a story on their editor that says that future global warming could be fairly benign. They are much more interested in gloom and doom. A scientist can spend twenty minutes describing new and important research, but if it can’t be expressed in simple, alarmist language, you can usually forget about a reporter using it. It has reached the point where the minimum amount of necessary alarm amounts to something like, “we have only ten years left to avert catastrophic global warming.” A reporter will probably run with that. After all, which story will most likely find its way into a news-paper: “Warming to Wipe out Half of Humanity,” or “Scientists Predict Little Warming”? It goes without saying that, in science, if you want to keep getting funded, you should find something Earth-shaking. And if you want to get your name in the newspaper, give a reporter some material that gives him hope of breaking the big story.

**No environment impacts**

**Ridder, 08,** BenPhd School of Geography and Environmental Studies, University of Tasmania, “Questioning the ecosystem services argument for biodiversity conservation” Biodiversity and conservation yr:2008 vol:17 iss:4 pg:781

\*ES = environmental services

The low resilience assumption

Advocates of the conservation of biodiversity tend not to acknowledge the distinction between resilient and sensitive ES. This ‘low resilience assumption’ gives rise to, and is reinforced by the almost ubiquitous claim within the conservation literature that ES depend on biodiversity. An extreme example of this claim is made by the Ehrlichs in Extinction. They state that “all [ecosystem services] will be threatened if the rate of extinctions continues to increase” then observe that attempts to artificially replicate natural processes “are no more than partially successful in most cases. Nature nearly always does it better. When society sacrifices natural services for some other gain… it must pay the costs of substitution” (Ehrlich and Ehrlich 1982, pp. 95–96). This assertion—that the only alternative to protecting every species is a world in which all ES have been substituted by artificial alternatives—is an extreme example of the ‘low resilience assumption’. Paul Ehrlich revisits this flawed logic in 1997 i nhis response (with four co-authors) to doubts expressed by Mark Sagoff regarding economic arguments for species conservation (Ehrlich et al. 1997, p. 101). The claim that ES depend on biodiversity is also notably present in the controversial Issues in Ecology paper on biodiversity and ecosystem functioning (Naeem et al. 1999) that sparked the debate mentioned in the introduction. This appears to reflect a general tendency among authors in this field (e.g., Hector et al. 2001; Lawler et al. 2002; Lyons et al. 2005). Although such authors may not actually articulate the low resilience assumption, presenting such claims in the absence of any clarification indicates its influence. That the low resilience assumption is largely false is apparent in the number of examples of species extinctions that have not brought about catastrophic ecosystem collapse and decline in ES, and in the generally limited ecosystem influence of species on the cusp of extinction. These issues have been raised by numerous authors, although given the absence of systematic attempts to verify propositions of this sort, the evidence assembled is usually anecdotal and we are forced to trust that an unbiased account of the situation has been presented. Fortunately a number of highly respected people have discussed this topic, not least being the prominent conservation biologist David Ehrenfeld. In 1978 he described the ‘conservation dilemma’, which “arises on the increasingly frequent occasions when we encounter a threatened part of Nature but can find no rational reason for keeping it” (Ehrenfeld 1981, p. 177). He continued with the following observation: Have there been permanent and significant ‘resource’ effects of the extinction, in the wild, of John Bartram’s great discovery, the beautiful tree Franklinia alatamaha, which had almost vanished from the earth when Bartram first set eyes upon it? Or a thousand species of tiny beetles that we never knew existed before or after their probable extermination? Can we even be certain than the eastern forests of the United States suffer the loss of their passenger pigeons and chestnuts in some tangible way that affects their vitality or permanence, their value to us? (p. 192) Later, at the first conference on biodiversity, Ehrenfeld (1988) reflected that most species “do not seem to have any conventional value at all” and that the rarest species are “the ones least likely to be missed… by no stretch of the imagination can we make them out to be vital cogs in the ecological machine” (p. 215). The appearance of comments within the environmental literature that are consistent with Ehrenfeld’s—and from authors whose academic standing is also worthy of respect—is uncommon but not unheard of (e.g., Tudge 1989; Ghilarov 1996; Sagoff 1997; Slobodkin 2001; Western 2001). The low resilience assumption is also undermined by the overwhelming tendency for the protection of specific endangered species to be justified by moral or aesthetic arguments, or a basic appeal to the necessity of conserving biodiversity, rather than by emphasising the actual ES these species provide or might be able to provide humanity. Often the only services that can be promoted in this regard relate to the ‘scientific’ or ‘cultural’ value of conserving a particular species, and the tourism revenue that might be associated with its continued existence. The preservation of such services is of an entirely different order compared with the collapse of human civilization predicted by the more pessimistic environmental authors. The popularity of the low resilience assumption is in part explained by the increased rhetorical force of arguments that highlight connections between the conservation of biodiversity, human survival and economic profit. However, it needs to be acknowledged by those who employ this approach that a number of negative implications are associated with any use of economic arguments to justify the conservation of biodiversity.

**Plan decreases oil pollution**

**Rucker, 13,** Chris “The environmental benefits of offshore drilling”, http://www.cfact.org/2013/10/17/the-environmental-benefits-of-offshore-drilling/

What can we do to clean up our oceans? Well one surprising answer may be to open up our coastlines to more offshore oil drilling, according to Ben Lieberman, a senior policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation. Lieberman explains: “There’s tremendous economic advantages to opening up more of America’s territorial waters to oil exploration and drilling, but there are environmental advantages as well. Most oil spills are not due to drilling but from natural seepage from the sea floor, and studies have shown that oil drilling reduces the pressure on those seeps and results in less oil pollution. So offshore drilling truly could be a win-win situation for the American people.” - See more at: <http://www.cfact.org/2013/10/17/the-environmental-benefits-of-offshore-drilling/#sthash.sZJhgLtY.dpuf>

#### Guaranteed to be safe

Gerard, 12, Jack, President and CEO of American Petroleum Institute, “Committed to Offshore Safety,” National Journal, 5-1, http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/04/what-more-can-be-done-to-ensur.php?comments=expandall#comments

Safe, dependable offshore oil and natural gas production in the Gulf of Mexico and off our coasts is vitally important to our economy and daily lives. The Gulf alone accounted for 27 percent of our country’s domestic production in 2011, and the amount should have been much higher. Every drop of oil produced here in the United States helps reduce imports, so ensuring reliable, environmentally responsible offshore production is in everyone’s interest. In response to Mr. Bromwich’s question, the industry has actively moved forward since the spill with concrete, effective measures to enhance offshore operations. Right after the accident industry went to work, examining every aspect of offshore drilling safety – including equipment, operating practices, sub-sea well control and containment and oil spill response – to see that another Macondo doesn’t happen. This effort is embodied in the creation and launch of the Center of Offshore Safety, which welcomed veteran Shell scientist Charlie Williams as its first executive director. Williams brings 40-plus years of experience in well engineering and offshore operations, with an emphasis in developing world-class standards to global operations. The center’s chief mission is prevention, with a strong focus on the establishment of robust offshore safety and environmental management systems. Let me describe what already has been done through the center and efforts across the industry, including API, the International Association of Drilling Contractors, the National Ocean Industries Association, the Offshore Operators Committee and individual companies: • Industry task forces have recommended multiple operational reforms, including requirements for maintaining multiple barriers during well construction and the implementation of testing requirements during drilling operations, to make sure everything is done properly. •API has updated the part of its industry standards regimen that establishes the benchmark for cementing operations and isolating potential flow zones in drilling operations, an integral element in maintaining well integrity. •Industry has invested significant resources in new and improved equipment to cap and contain blowouts and to quickly stop oil from leaking, in the unlikely event that happens. •Meanwhile, among other things, API is preparing new standards on designing deep water wells and safety management systems, and is revising standards covering the design, development, operation and maintenance of blowout preventers. •Right now, the Center for Offshore Safety is working with industry and regulators to establish strong safety and environmental management systems, as required by government regulations. These will be certified through a third-party audit. •Working with U.S. and international stakeholders, industry continues to assess the tools in the oil spill response toolkit – studying dispersants, in-situ burning and mechanical recovery, and working on enhanced planning documents. •These are just some of the measures that have been taken or that are under way – first, to prevent an offshore accident, second, to intervene and contain a spill at the wellhead and third, to be well-prepared in terms of planning, equipment, technical know-how and training to respond if an accident occurs. All demonstrate industry’s strong commitment to safe and responsible operations. In the 2010 spill’s aftermath, the bar for safety, prevention and accident response was necessarily raised. Industry has worked to enhance operational capabilities and move forward with a continuous commitment to safety. The industry understands that responsible stewardship must accompany the nation’s growing energy demands. Industry’s shared concern for both has driven its efforts to date and will do so going forward.

#### Experts agree

Holt, 12, David, President of Consumer Energy Alliance, “Technology is the Antidote to Risk,” National Journal, 5-1, http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/04/what-more-can-be-done-to-ensur.php?comments=expandall#comments

It’s quite fitting that we’re spending this week examining private sector developments in offshore safety. Tens of thousands of energy professionals from around the world have converged on Houston to answer the same question: How do we minimize the inherent risk present in offshore drilling? The Offshore Technology Conference nicely illustrates just how far the industry has come since the Deepwater Horizon tragedy. From state-of-the-art capping technology to the development of new “safety and environmental management systems,” the private sector and federal regulators have made significant progress to bolster the safety of offshore drilling. And, as OTC demonstrates, additional technologies are in the works. But, what’s really missing from this question is how we, as a nation, balance risk with reward. The risk of a catastrophic blowout remains very, very small. In over forty years of offshore drilling, the United States has suffered two very large oil spills resulting from a blowout – the Santa Barbara blowout in 1969 and Deepwater Horizon in 2010. In fact, since 1979, for every 130 billion barrels of oil produced worldwide, one well incident resulting in a large oil spill has occurred. Of these incidents, one-third was the result of military action. In the United States, from 1971-2009, over 41,500 wells (exploratory and production wells) were drilled in the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS), producing nearly 16 billion barrels of oil. Of these 41,500 wells, fifty well control incidents caused the release of oil. In effect, out of the billions of oil produced from the U.S. OCS, about 0.00001147% of the volume was spilled. For comparison sake, natural seeps account for approximately 63 percent of oil in the oceans while another 33 percent of oil in the ocean comes from cars, boats and planes.

#### No impact to oil spills

Schwennesen, 10, Paul, MA in government from Harvard University and a BS in History and Science (biology concentration) from the U.S. Air Force Academy, completed a fellowship at the Property & Environment Research Center (PERC), “The Catastrophe That Wasn’t: The Gulf Oil Spill in Perspective,” http://www.masterresource.org/2010/08/false-catastrophe-bp-spill/

Picture your neighbor’s pool. Unless you live in Malibu, it’ll contain about 6,000 gallons. That’s the “Gulf” for purposes of discussion. Now go to your garage, get a quart of oil and pour it in when he’s not looking. Pretty good sense of the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, right? Nope, not even close. Put a drop of that oil onto a sheet of paper and carefully cut it in half. Now do it again and toss that quarter of a drop into the deep end. Even this quarter droplet (about the size of the comma in this sentence) is about 10% too large, but NOW you have a sense of what 4.9 million barrels of oil in the Gulf looks like.[1] Now that we’ve grappled with the issue of scale, let’s look at the aftermath of this ‘catastrophe.’ According to the government scientists, seventy-five percent of that sliver of a droplet has now evaporated, been eaten by microbes, skimmed or burnt. (This estimate is in dispute, but every day the released oil is being reduced to get to that figure, if not beyond it.) Now, you’re going to need to borrow your kid’s microscope for the rest of this exercise…. “Ah,” says the ecologist in you, “but oil is like poison to an ecosystem, and so any amount is disproportionately harmful.” Well, the science doesn’t agree, but let’s assume for the moment that you’re right. Ignoring that the vast majority of this poison-oil has already been happily consumed by portions of this delicate ecosystem, let’s pretend that oil is to the Gulf what botulinum toxin is to man (really bad news, as it’s the deadliest substance known). Distributed uniformly, oil would contaminate the water of the Gulf at a ratio of eight thousand millionths per gallon. If the same concentration of botulinum existed in your swimming pool, you could safely spend the day in it without a second thought.[2] Sure, oil is not distributed uniformly, but shrill cries about the “collapse” of the Gulf’s ecosystem imply that it effects are. It is indeed true that every action has reverberating ecological consequences, but if we delude ourselves into thinking this means disintegration then we risk making poor policy choices. Good Intentions, Good Analysis, Good Policy Please don’t misunderstand. I am firmly in the camp of those who think the Gulf ecosystem is a wonderful and valuable thing that we should never take for granted. Furthermore, it’s not my intention here to dismiss or minimize BP’s bungle. Neither am I suggesting cleanup shouldn’t continue with the utmost diligence. After all, “scale” matters not one whit if that sliver of oil washes into your crab pots. Legally, BP should be held to account for their negligence and must make whole anyone whose property or livelihood they have harmed. But two lessons rise to the surface here. The first is to never underestimate the power of ecosystems to absorb shocks and adapt to change. While we should not treat Nature with reckless disregard, we should also not dishonor her by intimating that she stands in precarious balance, perennially on the brink of human-caused collapse. As ecology continues to develop as a science, I expect that it will be the extraordinary resilience of natural systems that will become the prevailing acknowledgment. The second lesson is that we must demand a sense of perspective when dealing with issues of environmental concern. The natural inclination when faced with torrents of extremely focused media coverage is to extrapolate broadly to “the ecosystem” at large. Hysteria and fear do not make for good policy, however. An inability to properly understand ecological sensitivity leads to dire predictions which fuel misguided regulatory reaction. For instance, President Obama’s intuition told him that, “everybody understands that when we are fouling the Earth like this, it has concrete implications not just for this generation, but for future generations.” A true statement, of course, since every action necessarily has “concrete implications.” The question is, how big are these implications? Do the imagined implications of this oil spill (foodweb collapse, fishery destruction, economic implosion of the Gulf Coast) warrant the sort of unwise knee-jerk decisions like the now-beleaguered six-month drilling moratorium which would have very surely precipitated vastly more destructive results? The ecological implications of this spill, I submit, will be relatively transitory and minimal. While conceding that “nobody really knows” the long-term effects, scientists generally agree that the sky isn’t falling. Comparable “disasters” such as the 1991 Persian Gulf spill (in which the retreating Iraqi Army perpetrated the largest spill in history) or the Ixtoc 1 spill off the coast of Yucatan (which gushed 3.5 million barrels for 290 days) can give us clues. In both cases, within three years the ecology had returned to pre-spill equilibrium. It would not be naively optimistic to expect a significantly more rapid recovery in the Gulf: conditions lend themselves well to natural oil degradation and very little oil has ended up in the vibrant coastal regions where life mostly congregates. It would be safe to assume that 99% of the spill’s effects (economic loss, fishery damage, species diversity/habitat loss) will have disappeared along with the oil in one year or less.

Offshore production doesn’t cause environmental harm-And natural seeps are way worse

Allen, 9 Bruce, co-founder of SOS California, and environmental and energy non-profit, “How Offshore Oil and Gas Production Benefits the Economy and the Environment,” Heritage Foundation Backgrouner #2341 on Energy and Environment, 11/30, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2009/11/how-offshore-oil-and-gas-production-benefits-the-economy-and-the-environment>, ALB

The oceans surrounding the United States hold tremendous oil and natural gas potential, but much of that potential is not being realized. Nearly 85 percent of these waters -- the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the eastern Gulf of Mexico -- are off-limits to exploration and drilling. Government studies estimate that these restricted areas hold at least 19 billion barrels of oil -- nearly 30 years' worth of current imports from Saudi Arabia -- and oil estimates are known to increase as exploration occurs. The greatest untapped potential lies in the Pacific. Producing this oil would increase oil supplies, lower prices, and generate large tax revenues -- while creating thousands of jobs in the domestic energy industry.¶ Drilling restrictions in general are imposed due to environmental concerns, despite the fact that offshore environmental damage has been greatly reduced by technologies that minimize the risk of oil spills and other hazards to the environment. In fact, offshore oil production has lowered the amount of oil released into the ocean by reducing natural seepage of oil, especially in areas with active offshore oil seeps, such as California's Santa Barbara coast.¶ Natural hydrocarbon seeps have historically been used to locate the world's usable sources of oil and tar. Papers published by British Petroleum in the early 1990s show that over 75 percent of the world's oil basins contain surface oil seeps. Most seeps emit small volumes of oil and gas that do not significantly deplete hydrocarbon reservoirs over the short term, but can add up to significant depletion of oil and gas over the longer term.¶ The knowledge that surface seepage has a direct link to subsurface oil and gas accumulations is not new and has been the impetus for many of the world's early major oil and gas discoveries by pioneers of oil production -- as far back as ancient China, and more recently the 1860s in Pennsylvania and the 1890s in Azerbaijan. Natural seeps were the impetus for early exploration of oil in Iran and Iraq in the early 1900s.

Natural seeps cause pollution-NOT industrialization

Allen, 9 Bruce, co-founder of SOS California, and environmental and energy non-profit, “How Offshore Oil and Gas Production Benefits the Economy and the Environment,” Heritage Foundation Backgrouner #2341 on Energy and Environment, 11/30, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2009/11/how-offshore-oil-and-gas-production-benefits-the-economy-and-the-environment>, ALB

Seeps are also one of the world's largest methane gas emission sources,[10] and are a major source of air pollution in Santa Barbara County. These coastal California seeps release oil and tar that washes ashore along nearly half the coastline of California, with the highest concentrations in Santa Barbara County. In the winter, the Davidson current washes seep oil and tar ashore as far north as the beaches of Santa Cruz and San Francisco.¶ The California Department of Fish Game often receives public calls reporting a possible oil spill on California central coast beaches, which is invariably determined to be natural seepage. The California Department of Fish Game requires that seep oil and tar collected on California beaches be treated as hazardous waste, the same as for industrial oil spills.¶ Offshore Production: Significant Reductions in Oil Pollution on California Beaches¶ One of the side affects of offshore oil production has been the reduction of oil and gas seepage due to decreases in subsea oil-reservoir pressure. Seep oil is chemically the same as commercially extracted oil, although the seep oil and tar have often undergone partial oxidation by the time they move into the water or onshore.

## Politics Answers

#### Plan is popular

Russell, 12, Barry President of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, “Energy Must Transcend Politics”, http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/08/finding-the-sweet-spot-biparti.php#2238176

There have been glimpses of great leadership, examples when legislators have reached across the aisle to construct and support common-sense legislation that encourages American energy production. Recent legislation from Congress which would replace the Obama administration’s five-year offshore leasing plan and instead increase access America’s abundant offshore oil and natural gas is one example of such bipartisanship. The House passed legislation with support from 25 key Democrats. The support from Republicans and Democrats is obviously not equal, but this bipartisan legislative victory demonstrates a commitment by the House of Representatives to support the jobs, economic growth and national security over stubborn allegiance to political party. The same is happening on the Senate side. Democratic Senators Jim Webb (VA), Mark Warner (VA), and Mary Landrieu (LA) cosponsored the Senate’s legislation to expand offshore oil and natural gas production with Republican Senators Lisa Murkowski (AK), John Hoeven (ND), and Jim Inhofe (OK). Senator Manchin (WV) is another Democratic leader who consistently votes to promote responsible energy development.

Winners

#### Momentum for it proves

Washington Independent, 11, “Offshore drilling vote sees bipartisan support in U.S. House, but not for Florida delegation”, http://washingtonindependent.com/109468/offshore-drilling-vote-sees-bipartisan-support-in-u-s-house-but-not-for-florida-delegation

The U.S. House of Representatives passed the second of its three-part package of bills aimed at encouraging offshore drilling on Wednesday. # More than two dozen Democrats joined Republicans in supporting the measure, but the Florida delegation voted strictly along party lines, with Republicans in support and Democrats in opposition. # Democratic Rep. Ted Deutch of Boca Raton made some noise about a provision that would steer drilling-related court cases – even those affecting Florida – to the Fifth Judicial Circuit, which has a reputation for being oil-friendly. Deutch offered an amendment to strike that provision, which failed. # The third piece of the pro-drilling package, which sets production targets for domestic oil and gas production, could pass as early as today. The bills face long odds in the Senate, where oil executives are getting grilled on industry tax breaks.

#### Massive opposition against the Plan – environmental concerns

**Tolliver, 14, “**The baggage of offshore drilling”, http://eaglefordtexas.com/news/id/101301/baggage-offshore-drilling/

Oceana, the world’s largest ocean conservation organization, is very outspoken against offshore drilling. They claim that Seismic airgun blast, used to find oil and gas deposits by mapping the sea floor, can deafen whales and dolphins permanently, leaving them without the ability to communicate with one another. The blast also disturb marine habits by killing fish larvae and disturbing spawning grounds.

## A2 Naval Readiness DA

#### Funding cuts destroyed the navy

**Freedberg, 13,** Sydney wrier for AOL Defense, “Aircraft Carriers: How Budget Cuts Delay Overhauls And Trim The Fleet” http://defense.aol.com/2013/03/20/sequester-cr-and-carriers-how-postponed-overhauls-ripple-throug/

With all the services reining in spending to cope with the current budget crisis, the second and third-order effects of cutbacks will ripple through the force for years. While [the Army "has it worst"](http://defense.aol.com/2013/03/12/army-has-it-worst-in-budget-crunch-dod-comptroller-robert-hal/) by the Pentagon comptroller's own assessment, the most complicated impacts are on the Navy, whose [carefully planned maintenance schedule](http://defense.aol.com/2013/02/01/navy-will-cancel-maintenance-on-23-ships-on-feb-15-small-shipy/) is falling apart. The fleet has already had to [halve its aircraft carrier presence in the Persian Gulf](http://defense.aol.com/2013/03/05/mattis-13-600-troops-afghanistan-iran-syria/), but delayed and cancelled overhauls will ultimately mean fewer ships in service in the years to come.¶ ¶ Ships require a lot of maintenance to work to stay ready for action, and none more than nuclear aircraft carriers. In addition to the regular pierside pitstops every type of vessel has to make, Nimitz-cl ass carriers need their reactors refueled and thoroughly overhauled halfway through their 50-year service life. This massive "Refueling and Complex Overhaul" (RCOH) can only be performed at [one shipyard in the nation](http://nns.huntingtoningalls.com/products/carriers/rcoh/index), [Huntington Ingalls](http://defense.aol.com/tag/Huntington+Ingalls/) Newport News yard in Virginia, so the next carrier has to come in as soon as the previous one is done. But last month the Navy [delayed the USS Abraham Lincoln's overhaul](http://www.navy.mil/submit/display.asp?story_id=71992) indefinitely for lack of funds. That will in turn delay the next carrier on the schedule, the George Washington, and so on down the line.

**Navy can’t deter anything – empirics**

**Daniel, 02**, Donald C.F. “The Future of American Naval Power: Propositions and Recommendations,” Globalization and American Power. Chapter 27. Institute for National Strategic Studies National Defense University, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/Books/Books\_2002/Globalization\_and\_Maritime\_Power\_Dec\_02/0 1\_toc.htm

In sum, there would seem to be a special role for the U.S. Navy in contingency response along littorals, but, outside the context of a specific crisis, constant day-to-day presence does not do much to deter unwanted behavior. Thus, it would seem a raising of false expectations to argue, for example, that the “gapping of aircraft carriers in areas of potential crisis is an invitation to disaster—and therefore represents culpable negligence on the part of America’s defense decision-makers.”33 In the early 1960s, the United States maintained three aircraft carrier battlegroups in the Mediterranean Sea but later gradually found that it needed to scale back. Currently, a single battlegroup operates there for less than 9 months of the year on average. This is a significant reduction, but no one can prove that the Mediterranean region became less stable. Conversely, the Navy began to maintain a regular presence in the Arabian Gulf in 1979, but this did not prevent Iran or Iraq from attacking ships during their war. In the 1980s, attacks generally increased in number over the 8 years of the war. As for deterring the initiation of a crisis in the first place, it is essentially impossible for an outsider to prove that such deterrence was successful except in the rare case in which a deterred party admits that he was deterred and states the reasons. Adam Siegel, John Arquilla, Paul Huth, Paul Davis, and a Rutgers Center for Global Security and Democracy team led by Edward Rhodes have each attempted to study the effects of forward presence and general deterrence. The deficiency of such study is always in making the definitive link between them. The majority of these studies suggest that “[h]istorically seapower has not done well as a deterrent” in preventing the outbreak of conflicts, principally because land-based powers not dependent on overseas trade are relatively “insensitive” to the operations of naval forces.

#### Plan doesn’t affect bases – even if they do – ships can go around drilling rigs

Klas, 10, Mary Ellen Klas, Tampa Bay Times, “Military brass: Gulf drilling won't harm training”, http://www.tampabay.com/blogs/the-buzz-florida-politics/content/military-brass-gulf-drilling-wont-harm-training

In an attempt to knock down one of the most powerful arguments against oil drilling off Florida's coasts, a coalition of military brass and Sen. Byron Dorgan, D-ND, released a report today saying that a new look at the issue shows there's less impact than previously believed. The report by Securing American's Future Energy, a non-profit pro-drilling organization, concluded: there aren't as many military missions occurring in areas where drilling has been prohibited, that the type of potential encroachment from oil and gas drilling on military operations is minimal, and that oil drilling and military **operations are able to co-exist**. "Even with additional training missions in that area, the impact of oil and gas exploration is not going to be significant and it should not decrease the readiness military units get in that area,'' said Col. Martin Sullivan, a retired commander in the U.S. Marine Corps, who produced the report for Commonwealth Consultaing Corp. Sullivan dismissed the testimony of officials from Eglin Air Force base who spoke to a state House committee last week, warning that the legislature's plan to bring oil drilling as close as three miles off Florida's coast would prove to be an obstacle to flight testing and missle exercises.The report did not consider the impact on military operations of oil and gas drilling within 10 miles in, he said. "What you have to consider is any squadron commander and any ship captain would be a little bit upset...with constrains on his training or testing,'' Sullivan said, noting they are not likely to support anything that would "creat additional problems for them. But, in essence, both the Air Force and Navy say there's less operations in the Gulf than there were in the past.''

It’s impractical to drill near naval operations anyway – will just shift to other areas

Barakat, 10, Matthew, Associated Press, <http://hamptonroads.com/2010/05/report-va-offshore-drilling-would-interfere-military-ops>

The report could be even more crippling. The Pentagon cannot unilaterally veto drilling proposals, but Dorothy Robyn, deputy under secretary of defense for installations and environment, said the Defense and Interior departments have a long history of cooperation, and drilling has never taken place in an area objected to by the military. "We have every expectation that if we said we need an area ... that they would fully honor that," Robyn said.

**Plan is key to the shipbuilding industry – turns the DA**

Mason, 09, Joseph R. – Louisiana State University Endowed Chair of Banking and nationally-renowned economist , “The Economic Contribution of Increased Offshore Oil Exploration and Production to Regional and National Economies”, February, <http://www.americanenergyalliance.org/images/aea_offshore_updated_final.pdf>

Offshore oil and gas production has a significant effect on local onshore economies as well as the national economy. There are broadly three “phases” of development that contribute to state economic growth: (1) the initial exploration and development of offshore facilities; (2) the extraction of oil and gas resources; and (3) refining crude oil into finished petroleum products. Industries supporting those phases are most evident in the sections of the Gulf of Mexico that are currently open to offshore drilling. For example, the U.S. shipbuilding industry — based largely in the Gulf region – benefits significantly from initial offshore oil exploration efforts.9 Exploration and development also requires specialized exploration and drilling vessels, floating drilling rigs, and miles and miles of steel pipe, as well as highly educated and specialized labor to staff the efforts. The onshore support does not end with production. A recent report prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy indicates that the Louisiana economy is “highly dependent on a wide variety of industries that depend on offshore oil and gas production”10 and that offshore production supports onshore production in the chemicals, platform fabrication, drilling services, transportation, and gas processing.11 Fleets of helicopters and U.S.- built vessels also supply offshore facilities with a wide range of industrial and consumer goods, from industrial spare parts to groceries. As explained in Section IV.G, however, the distance between offshore facilities and onshore communities can affect the relative intensity of the local economic effects. The economic effects in the refining phase are even more diffuse than the effects for the two preceding phases. Although significant capacity is located in California, Illinois, New Jersey, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington, additional U.S. refining capacity is spread widely around the country.12 As a result, refinery jobs, wages, and tax revenues are even more likely to extend into other areas of the country, including non-coastal states like Illinois.

### 1AR Funding

#### No funding takes out shipbuilding capacity

**O’Rouke, 13,** Ronald Specialist in Naval Affairs, “[Navy Force Structure and Shipbuilding Plans: Background and Issues for Congress](http://defense-legislation.blogspot.com/2013/03/navy-force-structure-and-shipbuilding_25.html)”, http://defense-legislation.blogspot.com/2013/03/navy-force-structure-and-shipbuilding\_25.html

Navy officials state that although there is much focus on the potential impacts on the military services of the sequestration of FY2013 DOD funding, the Navy is equally (if not more) concerned about the potential impact on the Navy of an extension of the current continuing resolution, or CR (H.J.Res. 117/P.L. 112-175 of September 28, 2012), through the end of the fiscal year. Shipbuilding and related programs that could experience execution problems under a year-long CR include the CVN-78 aircraft carrier program, the CVN Refueling Complex Overhaul (RCOH) program, the DDG-51 program, the DDG-1000 program, an amphibious assault ship (LHA) funded in a prior year, and the Moored Training Ship. On February 8, 2013, the Navy announced that, due to a lack of funding under the CR, it has postponed the RCOH of the aircraft carrier CVN-72. A sequester on FY2013 DOD funding could cause additional program-execution problems in Navy shipbuilding programs. The planned size of the Navy, the rate of Navy ship procurement, and the prospective affordability of the Navy’s shipbuilding plans have been matters of concern for the congressional defense committees for the past several years. In January 2013, the Navy presented to Congress a goal of achieving and maintaining a fleet of 306 ships, consisting of certain types and quantities of ships. The Navy’s proposed FY2013 budget requests funding for the procurement of 10 new battle force ships (i.e., ships that count against the 306 ship goal). The 10 ships include one Gerald R. Ford (CVN-78) class aircraft carrier, two Virginia-class attack submarines, two DDG- 51 class Aegis destroyers, four Littoral Combat Ships (LCSs), and one Joint High Speed Vessel (JHSV). These ships are funded through the Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN) account.

#### Sequester wrecked the navy

Lagrone, 13, “Inside the Navy’s Big Aircraft-Carrier Budget Gamble,” <http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2013/02/navy/all/1>The Navy is dealing with the military’s impending budget fiasco by putting its premier hardware — aircraft carriers — on the firing line. It’s unexpected, but it might actually be a smart move — if Congress cancels the deepest budget cuts. But if Congress keeps the cuts, then the Navy’s readiness to handle the security threats of the next several years will seriously decline — in many ways because of how the Navy buys stuff.¶ No, the Navy isn’t scrapping its aircraft carriers, the number-one symbol of American global power. In fact, last June, with the budget storm brewing, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta publicly swore the U.S. would remain an 11-carrier Navy. But last week, the Navy took the drastic step of canceling the deployment of the USS Harry Truman, which was scheduled to head for the Middle East; and delaying the years-long refueling of the USS Abraham Lincoln. The fleet was already down one carrier, with the December decommissioning of the USS Enterprise.¶ But the way the Navy buys, builds and maintains those carriers means that they’re going to be the first hit during the current budget battle.

### 1AR No Link

#### Safeguards solve the link – empirics prove

Emerald Coast News, 12, “Is Offshore Drilling Affecting National Security?”, <http://atd.agranite.com/emerald-coast/living/national-security-affected-by-offshore-platforms/>

Eglin has been working with the U.S. Department of the Interior’s Minerals Management Service – the agency that manages offshore drilling – for 25 years on the issue of offshore leases. In a June 2008 meeting, with the Minerals Management Service, the Air Force agreed to reassess its needs in the test and training range in the eastern Gulf to accommodate oil and gas exploration, according to a September article in the Bay Beacon. “We recognize the importance to national security provided by oil/gas energy and are working with (the Minerals Management Service) to accommodate new exploration without impact to our mission,” Arnold said. In 2005, Eglin created the Military Mission Line, a demarcation of its airspace extending south from Hurlburt Field. Military officials say **drilling and exploration on the west side of that line would not affect training and testing.** A ban on permanent, above-surface structures east of what is now the Military Mission Line was agreed on in 1986. This affected 95 previously granted exploration leases sold by the government in that area. For those leases, Eglin allowed five temporary blocks of time for exploration, one area at a time. These time blocks shifted every three months while the military test missions were temporarily moved to other areas. Should oil companies want to produce oil or gas platforms resulting from exploration, they would require a different kind of lease from the Minerals Management Service that has been coordinated with the military, according to Arnold. To date, no such requests have been approved. If production is ever permitted, the Air Force would prefer to see subsurface technology like that used off the Alabama coast, where above-surface platforms act as hubs connected to subsurface wells by pipelines and do not pose a risk to test and evaluation missions. “We’re perfectly OK with subsurface activity,” Arnold said. Eglin allowed construction in 2001 of a 36-inch diameter, 419-mile steel pipeline on the sea bed between Mobile, Ala., and Tampa – a path that took the project directly through Eglin’s water ranges. The $1.6 billion project provides Floridians with 1.2 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day without interfering with military missions.

### 1AR Shipbuilding

#### The plan revitalizes the shipbuilding industry

Mason, 09, Joseph R. – Louisiana State University Endowed Chair of Banking and nationally-renowned economist , “The Economic Contribution of Increased Offshore Oil Exploration and Production to Regional and National Economies”, February, <http://www.americanenergyalliance.org/images/aea_offshore_updated_final.pdf>

Onshore state and local economies benefit from the development of OCS resources by providing goods and services to offshore oil and gas extraction sites. Onshore communities provide all manner of goods and services required by offshore oil and gas extraction. A variety of industries are involved in this effort: shipbuilders provide exploration vessels, permanent and movable platforms, and resupply vessels; steelworkers fashion the drilling machinery and specialized pipes required for offshore resource extraction; accountants and bankers provide financial services; and other onshore employees provide groceries, transportation, refining, and other duties. These onshore jobs, in turn, support other jobs and other industries (such as retail and hospitality establishments).

#### That’s key to solve their impact

O'Rourke, 12, Ronald Specialist in Naval Affairs, “Navy Force Structure and Shipbuilding Plans: Background and Issues for Congress,” http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/RL32665.pdf

In February 2006, the Navy presented to Congress a goal of achieving and maintaining a fleet of 313 ships, consisting of certain types and quantities of ships. On March 28, 2012, the Department of Defense (DOD) submitted to Congress an FY2013 30-year (FY2013-FY2042) shipbuilding plan that includes a new goal for a fleet of about 310-316 ships. The Navy is conducting a force structure assessment, to be completed later this year, that could lead to a refinement of this 310316-ship plan. The Navy’s proposed FY2013 budget requests funding for the procurement of 10 new battle force ships (i.e., ships that count against the 310-316 ship goal). The 10 ships include one Gerald R. Ford (CVN-78) class aircraft carrier, two Virginia-class attack submarines, two DDG-51 class Aegis destroyers, four Littoral Combat Ships (LCSs), and one Joint High Speed Vessel (JHSV). These ships are all funded through the Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN) account

#### Strong shipbuilding is key to credible naval power

**Alberto, et al., 05,** Lieutenant Colonel Ronald P., U.S. Army, Colonel Michael G. Archuleta, U.S. Air Force, Lieutenant Colonel Steven H. Bills, U.S. Air Force, Commander William A. Bransom, U.S. Navy, Mr. Kenneth Cohen, Department of State, Commander William A. Ebbs, U.S. Navy, George Manjgaladze, Ministry of Defense, Republic of Georgia, Commander Elizabeth B. Myhre, U.S. Navy, Audrea M. Nelson, DA, Robert L. Riddick, Department of Defense, Colonel Christopher M. Ross, U.S. Army, Julia N. Ruhnke, DA, Lieutenant Colonel Gregory M. Ryan, U.S. Marine Corps, Colonel David D. Thompson, U.S. Air Force, Commander Hugh D. Wetherald, U.S. Navy, Dr. Mark Montroll, faculty at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Dr. Michael Farbman, USAID, faculty at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Captain David B. Hill, U.S. Coast Guard, faculty at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, “SHIPBUILDING”, The Industrial College of the Armed Forces, National Defense University, 2005, http://www.ndu.edu/icaf/programs/academic/industry/reports/2005/pdf/icaf-is-report-shipbuilding-2005.pdf

In conclusion, our study found that the tremendous advantage the US enjoys in naval power directly supports our national security through global power projection and maintaining freedom of the seas. Our ability to build large, highly capable naval ships is a vital part of our naval superiority and is therefore inexorably linked to our national security. The US must maintain it lead in naval power by protecting its domestic shipbuilding industry. It is our conclusion that the number one issue facing the American military shipbuilder today is the uncertainty in future orders for ship construction. The year to year fluctuation in the projected naval order book adds uncertainty for the shipbuilder wanting to invest in capital and labor improvement, and adds cost to the vessels actually being delivered. This fluctuation is exacerbated when the US Navy cancels entire ship classes or severely limits procurement of vessels that have been programs of record, programs which the shipbuilders have used to make labor and capital investment decisions. We feel it is imperative for the Navy to identify the force of the future and commit to a stable procurement plan to implement that force. The concept of Seabasing must mature at least to the point where the major yards can invest in the infrastructure necessary to build the force. In this area, we also conclude that the requirement for full funding of naval vessels in the year of authorization hampers the ability of the Navy and the industry to maintain a steady shipbuilding plan. It is apparent to us that the US Navy shipbuilding program is often used as a “bill payer” for other DoD priorities. In addition to the reality that the money is not obligated in the year of funding, the temptation to use the US Navy shipbuilding account to pay current year expenses is greater if significant procurement dollars are available to pay the full cost of individual ships. While we are convinced the nation must maintain sufficient shipbuilding capacity to allow for surge in national emergencies, we feel that the current and projected naval order book does not support the capacity being carried by the six largest shipyards. Restructuring of the industrial base is necessary. This restructuring may entail the politically difficult decision to allow some yards to close, but if the naval order book does not increase and the restructuring does not occur, unit cost will continue to skyrocket out of proportion to the value to the nation of the vessel.

## 2AC Russia DA

**Russian oil industry terminally unsustainable—diminishing returns**

**Mikhailov, 12**- International business journalism community laureate recipient “Russian economy on feet of clay”Gazeta 27.03.12 <http://en.gazeta.ru/opinions/2012/03/27/a_4107689.shtml>

At the core industry of Russian economy –in oil and gas – something is rotten. A crisis looms that could harm Russian economy even if oil prices do not fall. The role of Oil and Gas in the Russian economy. The revenues from the oil and gas industry are approximately half of Russia's budget. Oil and gas exports last year were 69% of all Russian exports. Imagine a nightmare scenario for a second: all of these revenues are gone. The budget deficit would total 10% of GNP. We would have to cut budget expenses in half or inflation would grow to 30% - 50% a year. The current trade balance surplus of almost $200 bln would turn into a trade balance deficit of $150 bln. The Ruble exchange value would fall two- or threefold. It would be a catastrophe for Russia. All our relative prosperity is based on oil and gas. But it wasn't always like this. Until 1980's, oil and gas exports didn't play a major part in the Soviet economy. Only after the oil price rise in the mid 70's did the USSR start to explore Western Siberia and build pipelines to the West. To preset day, the Russian economy lives off a Soviet investment project, accomplished almost half a century ago. All good things end one day. The oil from old wells becomes ever more expensive to extract, and the reservoirs are dwindling. The companies are not exploring new oilfields. Tax reform of the beginning of the 00's and the oil extraction stagnation The tax for resource extraction, introduced in 2002, came right on time – prices were rising and preparing to jump. The budget has skimmed the cream from world oil price growth, and the oilmen could only lick their lips, The ideology of a resource tax and the new export tariff was that the size of the tax depended on world oil price growth and the volume of extraction and export. it did not depend on the operation profits for oil companies. The budget received revenues that it didn't know what to do with. The government decided to just burn it in budget funds. While burning off the super-profits, the state resumed some harsh social reforms (like the monetization of benefits), and state tariffs for communal services and transport continued to go up. The Russian populace received only mere drops from the "oil downpour". And the state learned to regulate the oilmen. However high were the oil prices, the industry received only 8% - 11% profitability, no more. Moreover, the "investment allowance" on profit tax was cancelled, a rather harsh procedure on exploration expenses accounting was instituted (amortization and semi-amortization, not included in the prime cost). Let's try to remember the difference between the extraction industry and the processing industry. In resources extraction the ivestments in many cases substitute the operating costs to support the extraction, this is not an investment per se. Despite that, it was taxed to full extent. What do you expect from oil extraction industry after such a reform? Yes, you are right. The extraction fell in the beginning of 90-ies, after USSR collapse from 516 mln tons in 1990 to 307 mln tons in 1995. Then it grew from 324 mln tons in 2000 to 459 mln tons in 2004 – oil price was growing. And then, since 2005 and after the tax reform, it started to grow very slowly. During the feast for the oil tycoons, Russia had increased the extraction only a little, giving all the cream to their competitors. In 2008, when oil prices peaked, extraction even fell a bit. During the last 7 years, oil extraction has increased only 11%. Simply put, this is industry stagnation. It's evident this taxation system was built to maximize budget revenues and to "sanitize" the global price dynamics for the Russian oil industry. Oil and gas – a very different approach When the tax reform was instituted in the beginning of the 00's, oil was privately owned (Rosneft had not yet devoured Yukos and was a very average company in the industry), and gas belonged to the state. Gazprom was always considered by the government a spare 'wallet' for any tasks that are shy of more or less transparent budgets. We are not talking about whether Gazprom was a corruption watering hole for state officials. But it always has been the wallet for the stately desires if top officials, since Yeltsin. If they need to build a church, or sponsor a football team, or even launch the winter Olympics in a subtropical zone or a huge project putting metal into earth (pipeline building) – Gazprom always helped the government. Since the beginning of the tax reforms, the state has built a difference in taxation between oil and gas industries. Oilmen were squeezed clean and gasmen received a huge money resource. Profitability in the oil industry is holding at 10% (state companies have a little more because of some budget preferences). And Gazprom profitability has been holding at 30% for a long time. Feel the difference. If Gazprom was taxed like oil companies are, the federal budget would have received an additional 500 bln rubles in 2010 and 750 bln rubles in 2011. That equals to one more top-5 Russian oil company with all taxes forgiven. At the same time, Gazprom hits the taxpayers twice: by not paying taxes and increasing their tariffs. Every year, the company, with state permission, increases tariffs 15% (like this year) or more (as in previous years). This is much more than official inflation, usually twice as much. They are taking this money out of our pockets, gas is half of our electric energy, all electricity tariffs, communal services, transportation. They increase their grab from gas tariffs automatically, all to provide for Gazprom superprofits. In 2012, a twofold increase is planned to the resource tax for Gazprom. It will decrease its profitability only a little. But here we have a new promise from the prime minister and the president-elect Vladimir Putin (March 23) "If you feel some pressure in your company or industry in general, let's return to this conversation, discuss where and when can we support you, but we won't increase the tariff (higher than the planned 15% - A.M.)" The state needs to increase budget revenues a bit but it doesn't equate the task to oil and gas taxation. Why should it? It's so convenient to have a 'spare' trillion rubles of Gazprom profits, that can be used to finance state investment projects. And these projects are definitely not new fields. It's unnecessary for company 'political projects' – super-expensive new pipelines Gazprom doesn't especially need, Olympics, etc. The oilmen don't have money for development, Gazprom has lots of money that is not used for industry advancement. The outlook All the oil companies are talking about the extraction growth rate, putting it at 1.5 – 2 times in the next several years (usually 10 years or more – that way either the donkey dies, or the Emir). And all of them prefer not to point out that each ton of oil costs more for the company, both operating costs and investments. Russian oil companies have to sharply increase investments just to keep their current level of extraction. LUKoil in 2011 suffered a 5% extraction loss while increasing investments 25%. And it's a small jump when compared to other oil companies. TNK-BP, Gazpromneft and others also showed a sharp rise in investments. Rosneft increased extraction by approximately 2% and increased investments almost 50%. While talking about future oil extraction growth, the oilmen show basically negative results: tiny extraction growth with ever rising operating costs, investments and debts. With new evidence of dwindling resources and stagnation in new oil field exploration. For now, this negative information is drowned in reports of growing oil prices. But it's necessary to understand that the comfort zone in oil prices for Russian oilmen is shrinking on both sides. -- The prime cost for Arabian oilmen is two – three times lower than in Russia. For them, $40 for the barrel of oil is still superprofitable. For our oilmen, $60 is zero margin (and zero oil revenues for the state budget). The expenses grow and press profitability of the Russian oil industry from below. -- When the price is high, alternative energy projects become effective: shale gas and renewable energy sources such as wind, sun, geothermal energy, etc. Even with current oil and gas prices, they are pressing the prices from above. The most profitable industries in the Russian economy are getting sick, they are unable to increase their extraction. If the prices grow, they will start to lose to alternative energy sources and lose their share on the market. If the prices fall, the country will be kicked twice: from the fall in budget revenues and extraction stagnation. The vulnerability of Russian economy increases. The government is not going to change current system of taxation of oil and gas industries. I'm not going to say that the oilmen need as much money as Gazprom. But we need to renew their interest in world prices, encourage them to invest in new oil fields. Otherwise, the oil industry stagnation will turn into a recession. We have already received our close calls. Meanwhile, the installation of equal taxation of oil and gas industries and liquidation of "special tax regime" for Gazprom will only benefit Russia.

**High Russian oil profits cause Dutch disease—they’re especially vulnerable**

**Wharton 07** (“Russia: 'Floating on an Enormous Pool of Petrodollars'” Knowledge@Wharton – Upenn April 24, 2007 http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article.cfm?articleid=1717&specialid=66

The "Dutch Disease" Just as troubling for Russia's future is the so-called resource curse, which can be split into separate, but related, challenges. One of them is purely economic, and the other, political. On the economic side, gushing oil revenues can atrophy an economy, making it less competitive overall, says Yadviga Semikolenova, an economist at the Colorado School of Mines. "When you start exporting huge amounts of oil, your currency appreciates, and that hurts your exports from non-oil sectors. And labor moves to the oil sector, which hurts the non-oil sectors even more. So the booming sector gets too much investment and the other sectors don't get enough." Economists call this phenomenon the "Dutch disease," after Holland, where it was originally observed. There, manufacturing withered after discoveries of gas in the North Sea. Prudent fiscal policy can manage the risk, and so far, the Putin government has shown an ability to do so. It has parked a big chunk of the government's oil revenues in a special stabilization fund, and it has paid down its debts. "Paying off foreign debt is one of the few things you can do with petrorubles that doesn't cause inflation," points out Georgetown's Balzer. "But it's also a way of walling yourself off from the international economy. I think part of why Putin is doing it is [because he doesn't want to] have to explain himself to foreign bankers." Balzer also wonders whether the government will relax its fiscal responsibility as next year's presidential election approaches. "It has socked away $80 billion in the stabilization fund, but as a proportion of GDP, it's a tenth of Norway's. Keeping the politicians' hands off of the money will be one of the hardest things [the government does]." Indeed, the political temptations of easy oil money represent the other half of the resource curse. Simply put, in places like Russia that lack strong regulators and courts, people in power will try to grab as much of the oil wealth as they can for themselves, rather than investing for the country's future. "Russia would have a corruption problem even if it didn't have wealth in oil and natural resources," says Bill Tompson, an economist and Russia expert at the OECD. "But the oil aggravates it." Oil riches, which are finite, give people the incentive to try to finagle money for themselves, and Russia's lack of political and corporate transparency gives them the cover to do so. "You're talking about an environment where a lot of decision-making is opaque, and systems that run on informal rules will always favor insiders." The 1990s in Russia "were wild, crazy and disorderly," Tompson adds. "There was a breakdown of any official ethics, of the norms and understandings of what you could and couldn't do. And you don't have a free press -- or at least it doesn't get far when it tries to pursue these matters."

**1AR Dutch Disease**

**Russia is extremely vulnerable to Dutch disease—kills the economy**

**Buckley, 12,** Neil, “Economy: Oil Dependence Remains a Fundamental Difference,” 6/20, Financial Times, [http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/438712b2-b497-11e1-bb2e-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1ypkFB0pH](http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/438712b2-b497-11e1-bb2e-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1ypkFB0pH)//mat)

Moscow’s dollar-denominated stock market index is down more than 20 per cent since this year’s mid-March peak, while the rouble has fallen 13 per cent against the dollar. Is Russia’s economy again headed for a fall? Investors might be forgiven for fearing it is 2008 all over again. That year, the stock market began a seven-month, 80 per cent decline from peak to trough, as oil and commodity prices slumped, followed by the collapse of Lehman Brothers in September. Russia’s economy went on to shrink by 7.8 per cent in 2009, the deepest recession of any G20 country. The recent market slides reflect a 20 per cent decline in Brent crude prices since March, which reached $100 a barrel by early June, and intensifying concerns that Greece could crash out of the eurozone, dealing a Lehman-style shock to the global economy. But many analysts say the recent falls are an overreaction typical of Russian markets. The country is in many ways less vulnerable to external shocks than it was four years ago, even though it has become ever more dependent on oil prices. Charles Robertson, global chief economist at Renaissance Capital, the Moscow-based investment bank, says: “In 2008, markets priced Russia as if it was going to offer a repeat of 1998,” referring to the 1990s default on domestic debt. “Now, the markets are pricing Russia like it’s going to be 2008 again.” The foreign debt of banks and companies is much lower than it was four years ago, making the economy less susceptible to a sudden halt to financing and the macroeconomic position also looks robust. Russia has foreign exchange reserves of $500bn, a current account surplus last year of more than 5 per cent of gross domestic product, and public debt below 10 per cent of GDP. Growth was a respectable 4.3 per cent in both 2010 and 2011, and the International Monetary Fund is forecasting 4 per cent growth this year and next. Russia can, of course, never be immune. Sberbank, the country’s biggest bank, warned last month that, if Greece withdrew from the euro in the final quarter of 2012 in an “unregulated” way, Russia’s GDP would contract 2.1 per cent next year. Renaissance Capital says an “orderly” Greek exit would prompt a modest slowdown in Russia’s growth to 2 per cent this year and 2.9 per cent next; a disorderly exit would cause a mild 2013 recession of 0.2 per cent. If Spain also left the euro, Renaissance forecast that Russian output would decline 2.7 per cent this year and 5 per cent in 2013. What is notable about all those forecasts is that they are less severe than Russia’s 2009 recession. But some analysts are more cautious. Russia’s Higher School of Economics warns that if a global slowdown reduced oil prices even to $80 a barrel, the government would quickly burn through its $60bn rainy-day reserve fund to meet its budget obligations. Oil dependency is seen as Russia’s biggest weakness. This year’s budget needs an oil price of more than $120 a barrel to balance, lifting the non-oil deficit, the shortfall excluding oil and gas revenues, to 12.5 per cent of GDP. It was below 5 per cent before 2008. Returning president Vladimir Putin, made some costly election promises which totalled about Rbs10tn ($309bn) by 2018, even excluding ambitious military spending increases, notes Sergei Aleksashenko, a former deputy central bank governor, now director of macroeconomic studies at the Higher School. Oil prices would need to grow by $10 to $15 a year, he adds, otherwise the “budget will not be affordable”, forcing Russia to increase borrowing or reduce spending. Economists have also warned that, with budgetary spending becoming a bigger contributor to growth, and that, in its turn, increasingly funded by oil and gas revenues, Russia is drawing too heavily on its energy wealth. That drives up prices and costs, crowds out private sector investment and makes manufacturing uncompetitive, all classic symptoms of the so-called Dutch disease. This hinders what should be its main policy aim: diversifying the economy away from reliance on extractive industries.

### A2: Russian Economy

**Russian stability does not depend on its economy**

**Goodrich and Zeihan 09** [Lauren Goodrich, Stratfor's Director of Analysis and Senior Eurasia analyst, and Peter Zeihan, Vice President of Analysis at Stratfor, “The Financial Crisis and the Six Pillars of Russian Strength,” March 3 2009, <http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/20090302_financial_crisis_and_six_pillars_russian_strength>]

Politics: It is no secret that **the Kremlin uses an iron fist to maintain domestic control**. There are few domestic forces the government cannot control or balance. The Kremlin understands the revolutions (1917 in particular) and collapses (1991 in particular) of the past, and it has control mechanisms in place to prevent a repeat. This control is seen in every aspect of Russian life, from one main political party ruling the country to the lack of diversified media, limits on public demonstrations and the infiltration of the security services into nearly every aspect of the Russian system. This domination was fortified under Stalin and has been re-established under the reign of former President and now-Prime Minister Vladimir Putin. This political strength is based on **neither financial nor economic foundations**. Instead, it is based within the political institutions and parties, on the lack of a meaningful opposition, and with the backing of the military and security services. Russia's neighbors, especially in Europe, cannot count on the same political strength because their systems are simply not set up the same way. The stability of the Russian government and lack of stability in the former Soviet states and much of Central Europe have also allowed the Kremlin to reach beyond Russia and influence its neighbors to the east. Now as before, when some of its former Soviet subjects -- such as Ukraine -- become destabilized, Russia sweeps in as a source of stability and authority, regardless of whether this benefits the recipient of Moscow's attention

**No impact to Russian economy**

**Blackwill, 09** – former associate dean of the Kennedy School of Government and Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor for Strategic Planning (Robert, RAND, “The Geopolitical Consequences of the World Economic Recession—A Caution”, http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional\_papers/2009/RAND\_OP275.pdf, WEA)

Now on to Russia. Again, five years from today. Did the global recession and Russia’s present serious economic problems substantially modify Russian foreign policy? No. (President Obama is beginning his early July visit to Moscow as this paper goes to press; nothing fundamental will result from that visit). Did it produce a serious weakening of Vladimir Putin’s power and authority in Russia? No, as recent polls in Russia make clear. Did it reduce Russian worries and capacities to oppose NATO enlargement and defense measures eastward? No. Did it affect Russia’s willingness to accept much tougher sanctions against Iran? No. Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov has said there is no evidence that Iran intends to make a nuclear weapon.25 In sum, Russian foreign policy is today on a steady, consistent path that can be characterized as follows: to resurrect Russia’s standing as a great power; to reestablish Russian primary influence over the space of the former Soviet Union; to resist Western eff orts to encroach on the space of the former Soviet Union; to revive Russia’s military might and power projection; to extend the reach of Russian diplomacy in Europe, Asia, and beyond; and to oppose American global primacy. For Moscow, these foreign policy first principles are here to stay, as they have existed in Russia for centuries. 26 None of these enduring objectives of Russian foreign policy are likely to be changed in any serious way by the economic crisis.

**No impact to Russian econ**

**Stent 03** – Angela E. Stent, professor of government and foreign service, and director of the Center for Eurasian, Russian and East European Studies at Georgetown University, Winter 2003, World Policy Journal, p. 75-76

Using extensive interviews with participants in all three administrations, and memoirs by former officials, they paint a compelling picture of officials often overwhelmed by the challenge of an entirely new reality. The unexpected collapse of communism and of the Soviet Union, coming just after the Gulf War, left them with no road map to understand how Russia and other post-Soviet states might develop. Nightmare scenarios suggested themselves: nuclear war between Russia and Ukraine; weapons proliferation on a terrifying scale; Yugoslav-type ethnically based civil war on the territory of the former Soviet Union; mass starvation; economic collapse—the ominous possibilities were endless. That these “dogs did not bark” is testimony to the unwillingness of people in the post-Soviet space to engage in armed conflict and to Western assistance that staved off famine and economic collapse. The failure of catastrophic scenarios to come about is one indicator of success—but if one were to measure America’s contribution to transforming Russia in more positive ways, the evidence is more mixed. If a minimalist definition of success was the absence of catastrophe, the maximalist definition was the creation of a fully functioning democracy in Russia with a transparent market economy and the rule of law. That has not happened yet, and it is unclear when it will. So far, there is no consensus about what would constitute a realistic timetable for Russia’s democratic development.

No impact to Russian economy.

World Policy Journal **0**3 – “Russia and America: How Close an Embrace?”, 1/22, http://www.worldpolicy.newschool.edu/journal/articles/wpj03-4/stent.html

Using extensive interviews with participants in all three administrations, and memoirs by former officials, they paint a compelling picture of officials often over-whelmed by the challenge of an entirely new reality. The unexpected collapse of communism and of the Soviet Union, coming just after the GulfWar, left them with no road map to understand how Russia and other post-Soviet states might develop. Nightmare scenarios suggested themselves: nuclear war between Russia and Ukraine; weapons proliferation on a terrifying scale; Yugoslav-type ethnically based civil war on the territory of the former Soviet Union; mass starvation; economic collapse--the ominous possibilities were endless. That these "dogs did not bark" is testimony to the unwillingness of people in the post-Soviet space to engage in armed conflict and to Western assistance that staved off famine and economic collapse. The failure of catastrophic scenarios to come about is one indicator of success--but if one were to measure America's contribution to transforming Russia in more positive ways, the evidence is more mixed. If a minimalist definition of success was the absence of catastrophe, the maximalist definition was the creation of a fully functioning democracy in Russia with a transparent market economy and the rule of law. That has not happened yet, and it is unclear when it will. So far, there is no consensus about what would constitute a realistic timetable for Russia's democratic development.
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### 1NC

**OCS destroys the environment – multitude of warrants – no safeguards**

**NRDC, 09,** National Defense Research Council, “Protecting Our Ocean ¶ and Coastal Economies: ¶ Avoid Unnecessary Risks from ¶ Offshore Drilling”, http://www.nrdc.org/oceans/offshore/files/offshore.pdf

**Offshore Drilling Poses Serious** ¶ **Environmental Risk**s¶ Expanded offshore drilling poses the risk of oil ¶ spills ruining our beaches from Florida to Maine ¶ and along the Pacific Coast, bringing harm to ¶ those who live, work, and vacation along the ¶ coasts, as well as harming habitats critical to ¶ plants and animals. ¶ Oil spills can quickly traverse vast distances. ¶ For example, when powered by the Gulf of ¶ Mexico’s Loop Current, an oil spill in the eastern ¶ Gulf of Mexico could affect Florida’s Panhandle ¶ beaches and even travel around the Florida Keys ¶ to wreak havoc on estuaries and beaches from the ¶ Everglades to Cape Canaveral.1¶ Contamination ¶ from the massive 1989 Exxon Valdez oil spill ¶ reached shorelines nearly 600 miles away; if the ¶ spill had occurred on the East Coast, it would have ¶ extended from Massachusetts to North Carolina.2¶ In September 2008, Hurricane Ike destroyed ¶ oil platforms, tanks, and pipelines throughout the ¶ Gulf of Mexico, releasing at least a half-million ¶ gallons of crude oil.3¶ During Hurricanes Katrina ¶ and Rita there were 125 spills from platforms, rigs, ¶ and pipelines on the ocean’s Outer Continental ¶ Shelf, releasing almost 685,000 gallons of ¶ petroleum products.4¶ Worse yet, if you include the ¶ land-based infrastructure that supports offshore ¶ drilling, the damage from these two hurricanes ¶ includes 595 spills releasing millions of gallons of ¶ oil.5¶ Oil Spills Inflict Devastating Economic ¶ Losses Upon Coastal Communities¶ Oil spills exact a serious toll on coastal economies, ¶ including our approximately $35 billion ¶ commercial fishing and $60 billion ocean and ¶ coastal tourism and recreation industries.6¶ The ¶ damage and clean up costs following the Exxon ¶ Valdez spill were so extensive that Exxon paid ¶ out more than one billion dollars to the federal ¶ and state governments for damages and clean up ¶ costs—and still owes fishermen, Alaska Natives, ¶ business owners, and others a billion dollars to ¶ redress the spill’s harm.7¶ ¶ In another example of economic and ¶ environmental damage, a July 2008 accident ¶ between a chemical tanker and an oil barge ¶ discharged more than 270,000 gallons of fuel ¶ oil, closing a huge swath of the Lower Mississippi ¶ River to vessel traffic for several days. The Port ¶ of New Orleans, located at the center of the ¶ world’s busiest port complex, was shut down and ¶ residents were asked to conserve water when water ¶ intakes were closed to prevent contamination of ¶ drinking water.¶ Oil Spills Have Lasting ¶ Ecological Impacts ¶ According to the National Academy of Sciences, ¶ current cleanup methods can only remove a small ¶ fraction of the oil spilled into the ocean, leaving ¶ the remaining oil to continue affecting ocean ¶ ecosystems over time.9¶ Scientists investigating ¶ the long-term impacts of the Exxon Valdez spill ¶ estimate that nearly 20,000 gallons of oil from that ¶ spill remain in Prince William Sound, continuing ¶ to harm threatened and endangered species and ¶ undermine their recovery.10 Marine mammals, sea ¶ birds, fish, shellfish, and other sea life are extremely ¶ vulnerable to oil pollution and the long-term ¶ toxic effects can impair reproductive success for ¶ generations. Studies have shown that tiny amounts ¶ of oil—as little as one part per billion—can harm ¶ pink salmon and cause their eggs to fail.11 ¶ Spills Aside, Drilling Operations ¶ are a Major Source of Pollution¶ In addition to environmental damage from oil ¶ spills, the routine operations associated with ¶ offshore drilling produce many toxic wastes ¶ and other forms of pollution. For example, ¶ each drill well generates tens of thousands of ¶ gallons of waste drilling muds (materials used ¶ to lubricate drill bits and maintain pressure) ¶ and cuttings.12 Drilling muds contain toxic ¶ metals such as mercury, lead, and cadmium that ¶ may bioaccumulate and biomagnify in marine ¶ organisms, including in our seafood supply.13 ¶ The water that is brought up from a ¶ given well along with oil and gas, referred to ¶ as “produced water,” contains its own toxic ¶ brew of benzene, arsenic, lead, toluene, and ¶ varying amounts of radioactive pollutants. ¶ Each oil platform can discharge hundreds of ¶ thousands of gallons of this produced water daily, ¶ contaminating both local waters and those down ¶ current from the discharge.14 An average oil and ¶ gas exploration well spews roughly 50 tons of ¶ nitrogen oxides, 13 tons of carbon monoxide, ¶ 6 tons of sulfur oxides, and 5 tons of volatile ¶ organic chemicals.15 ¶ Drilling Exploration Activities ¶ Harm Marine Life¶ Seismic surveys designed to estimate the size ¶ of an oil and gas reserve generate their own ¶ environmental problems. To carry out such ¶ surveys, ships tow multiple airgun arrays that ¶ emit thousands of high-decibel explosive impulses ¶ to map the seafloor.16 The auditory assault from ¶ seismic surveys has been found to damage or kill ¶ fish eggs and larvae and to impair the hearing ¶ and health of fish, making them vulnerable to ¶ predators and leaving them unable to locate prey ¶ or mates or communicate with each other. These ¶ disturbances disrupt and displace important ¶ migratory patterns, pushing marine life away ¶ from suitable habitats like nurseries and foraging, ¶ mating, spawning, and migratory corridors.17 In ¶ addition, seismic surveys have been implicated in ¶ whale beaching and stranding incidents.18¶ Offshore Drilling Results in ¶ Onshore Damage¶ Offshore drilling requires the construction of ¶ significant onshore infrastructure such as new ¶ roads, pipelines, and processing facilities, which ¶ are often built on formerly pristine beaches. ¶ Thanks in part to drilling operations, Louisiana is ¶ losing roughly 24 square miles of coastal wetlands ¶ each year, eating away at natural storm barriers and ¶ increasing the risks of storm damage, including ¶ damage from oil spills.19

**Causes oil spills – those alone are sufficient to cause extinction**

Adams, 10, “The Guld Oil Spill: An Extinction Level Event?”, Blogspot, <http://coyoteprime-runningcauseicantfly.blogspot.com/2010/05/gulf-oil-spill-extinction-level-event.html>

The possibility of an extinction event? It's hard to say exactly what's going on in the Gulf right now, especially because there are so many conflicting reports and unanswered questions. But one thing's for sure: if the situation is actually much worse than we're being led to believe, there could be worldwide catastrophic consequences. If it's true that millions upon millions of gallons of crude oil are flooding the Gulf with no end in sight, the massive oil slicks being created could make their way into the Gulf Stream currents, which would carry them not only up the East Coast but around the world where they could absolutely destroy the global fishing industries. Already these slicks are making their way into Gulf wetlands and beaches where they are destroying birds, fish, and even oyster beds. This is disastrous for both the seafood industry and the people whose livelihoods depend on it. It's also devastating to the local wildlife which could begin to die off from petroleum toxicity. Various ecosystems around the world could be heavily impacted by this spill in ways that we don't even yet realize. There's no telling where this continuous stream of oil will end up and what damage it might cause. Theoretically, we could be looking at modern man's final act of destruction on planet Earth, because this one oil rig blowout could set in motion a global extinction wave that begins with the oceans and then whiplashes back onto human beings themselves. We cannot live without life in the oceans. Man is arrogant to drill so deeply into the belly of Mother Earth, and through this arrogance, we may have just set in motion events that will ultimately destroy us. In the future, we may in fact talk about life on Earth as "pre-spill" versus "post-spill." Because a post-spill world may be drowned in oil, devoid of much ocean life, and suffering a global extinction event that will crash the human population by 90 percent or more.

#### Environmental degradation causes extinction

Coyne and Hoekstra 07, Jerry professor in the Department of Ecology and Evolution at the University of Chicago and Hopi Associate Professor in the Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology at Harvard University, New Republic, “The Greatest Dying,” 9/24, http://www.truthout.org/article/jerry-coyne-and-hopi-e-hoekstra-the-greatest-dying

But it isn't just the destruction of the rainforests that should trouble us. Healthy ecosystems the world over provide hidden services like waste disposal, nutrient cycling, soil formation, water purification, and oxygen production. Such services are best rendered by ecosystems that are diverse. Yet, through both intention and accident, humans have introduced exotic species that turn biodiversity into monoculture. Fast-growing zebra mussels, for example, have outcompeted more than 15 species of native mussels in North America's Great Lakes and have damaged harbors and water-treatment plants. Native prairies are becoming dominated by single species (often genetically homogenous) of corn or wheat. Thanks to these developments, soils will erode and become unproductive - which, along with temperature change, will diminish agricultural yields. Meanwhile, with increased pollution and runoff, as well as reduced forest cover, ecosystems will no longer be able to purify water; and a shortage of clean water spells disaster. In many ways, oceans are the most vulnerable areas of all. As overfishing eliminates major predators, while polluted and warming waters kill off phytoplankton, the intricateaquaticfoodweb could collapse from both sides. Fish, on which so many humans depend, will be a fond memory. As phytoplankton vanish, so does the ability of the oceans to absorb carbon dioxide and produce oxygen. (Half of the oxygen we breathe is made by phytoplankton, with the rest coming from land plants.) Species extinction is also imperiling coral reefs - a major problem since these reefs have far more than recreational value: They provide tremendous amounts of food for human populations and buffer coastlines against erosion. In fact, the global value of "hidden" services provided by ecosystems - those services, like waste disposal, that aren't bought and sold in the marketplace - has been estimated to be as much as $50 trillion per year, roughly equal to the gross domestic product of all countries combined. And that doesn't include tangible goods like fish and timber. Life as we know it would be impossible if ecosystems collapsed. Yet that is where we're heading if species extinction continues at its current pace. Extinction also has a huge impact on medicine. Who really cares if, say, a worm in the remote swamps of French Guiana goes extinct? Well, those who suffer from cardiovascular disease. The recent discovery of a rare South American leech has led to the isolation of a powerful enzyme that, unlike other anticoagulants, not only prevents blood from clotting but also dissolves existing clots. And it's not just this one species of worm: Its wriggly relatives have evolved other biomedically valuable proteins, including antistatin (a potential anticancer agent), decorsin and ornatin (platelet aggregation inhibitors), and hirudin (another anticoagulant). Plants, too, are pharmaceutical gold mines. The bark of trees, for example, has given us quinine (the first cure for malaria), taxol (a drug highly effective against ovarian and breast cancer), and aspirin. More than a quarter of the medicines on our pharmacy shelves were originally derived from plants. The sap of the Madagascar periwinkle contains more than 70 useful alkaloids, including vincristine, a powerful anticancer drug that saved the life of one of our friends. Of the roughly 250,000 plant species on Earth, fewer than 5 percent have been screened for pharmaceutical properties. Who knows what life-saving drugs remain to be discovered? Given current extinction rates, it's estimated that we're losing one valuable drug every two years. Our arguments so far have tacitly assumed that species are worth saving only in proportion to their economic value and their effects on our quality of life, an attitude that is strongly ingrained, especially in Americans. That is why conservationists always base their case on an economic calculus. But we biologists know in our hearts that there are deeper and equally compelling reasons to worry about the loss of biodiversity: namely, simple morality and intellectual values that transcend pecuniary interests. What, for example, gives us the right to destroy other creatures? And what could be more thrilling than looking around us, seeing that we are surrounded by our evolutionary cousins, and realizing that we all got here by the same simple process of natural selection? To biologists, and potentially everyone else, apprehending the genetic kinship and common origin of all species is a spiritual experience - not necessarily religious, but spiritual nonetheless, for it stirs the soul. But, whether or not one is moved by such concerns, it is certain that our future is bleak if we do nothing to stem this sixth extinction. We are creating a world in which exotic diseases flourish but natural medicinal cures are lost; a world in which carbon waste accumulates while food sources dwindle; a world of sweltering heat, failing crops, and impure water. In the end, wemust accept the possibility that we ourselves are not immune to extinction. Or, if we survive, perhaps only a few of us will remain, scratching out a grubby existence on a devastated planet. Global warming will seem like a secondary problem when humanity finally faces the consequences of what we have done to nature: not just another Great Dying, but perhaps the greatest dying of them all.

### 2NC Link

**Their evidence doesn’t assume the mindless all-out exploitation that they incentivize**

Flournoy, 11, Alyson Professor and Director of the Environmental and Land Use Law Program @ University of Florida Levin College of Law, ARTICLE: THREE META-LESSONS GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY SHOULD LEARN FROM THE BP DEEPWATER HORIZON DISASTER AND WHY THEY WILL NOT,” Boston College Environmental Affairs Law Review, 2011, 38 B.C. Envtl. Aff. L. Rev. 281

C. How to Learn from the Context of the Disaster: United States' Energy Policy A third meta-lesson from the BP Deepwater Horizon disaster is that the drilling of that particular offshore well is the result not just of private choice, but of a broader national policy on energy. MMS's oil leasing and permitting decisions reflect executive branch decisions about the disposition of publicly owned oil and gas resources. [n115](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n115) BP's decisions about exploration in that area were not made in a vacuum, but in the context of a set of laws and appropriations that create a variety of incentives that affect industry's behavior. Thus, to understand why the disaster occurred, it would be wise to look at the policy context that has produced the increasing rush to develop oil resources in deepwater, and increasingly in ultra-deepwater--areas that increase the complexity, risks, and uncertainty of drilling operations and potential accidents. [n116](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n116) The most visible leadership on this issue comes from statements of the Oil Spill Commission and its Co-Chair Bob Graham, who has repeatedly noted that the lack of an energy policy is an important issue related to the work of the Oil Spill Commission and one that must be addressed by the legislative and executive branches. [n117](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n117) [\*301] The current energy policy provides hefty subsidies for the highly profitable oil and gas industries to continue with their unwavering focus on producing more oil and gas. [n118](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n118) Although some say that the United States lacks an energy policy, it is more accurate to say that our leaders don't clearly articulate the operative energy policy. Perhaps this is because it is not a coherent one or because on close inspection it is difficult to justify in light of other stated priorities. A primary and often overlooked component of energy policy is the national policy on the privatization of public natural resources. U.S. policy is to give away its natural resources at bargain prices presumably to promote exploitation and development. [n119](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n119) A 2008 report by the Government Accountability Office compared U.S. royalty rates to those of 103 other jurisdictions, and only eleven had royalty rates lower than those of the United States. [n120](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n120) Moreover, the Government Accountability Office has made repeated reports of problems with uncollected royalties and with MMS's royalty-in-kind program that has led to underestimation of the royalties owed. [n121](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n121) Another significant component of the national energy policy is tax policy that directly affects investment in oil extraction. A 2005 Congressional Budget Office Report showed that many capital investments for oil extraction are taxed at a rate of nine percent, which ranks among [\*302] the lowest rates for any industry. [n122](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n122) Tax deductions and credits for the oil extraction industry amount to roughly $ 4 billion per year. [n123](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n123) Looked at as a whole, the current energy policy strongly encourages all-out exploitation of remaining domestic fossil fuel resources, and deepwater oil reserves in particular. If the public and elected officials believe that the risks that produced the Macondo Well blowout are unacceptable, an energy policy that will move us towards a clean energy path is a logical response. This could include increased government support for lower carbon, lower-risk energy paths. Despite the clear political opportunity provided by the Deepwater Horizon disaster for the President and Congress to focus attention on a broad clean energy policy, there have been few signs of any significant movement in that direction. [n124](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n124) The CLEAR Act included provisions that would eliminate some of the royalty relief for deepwater drilling, eliminate the disastrous royalty-in-kind program, and require BOEMRE to study global royalty payments to inform U.S. royalty policy. [n125](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n125) These are very positive steps that would reduce the mindless incentives for deepwater drilling and the unintended windfalls to oil companies. However, that Act has languished in the Senate. Moreover, even those proposed changes fail to address the broader question of whether policy should create incentives towards a cleaner energy path. In the wake of the November 2010 election, it seems highly unlikely that the Administration or Congress will have interest in this topic. [n126](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n126) CONCLUSION There is much that can be learned from the BP Deepwater Horizon disaster. Unfortunately, even learning the most specific lessons has proved a contentious and uncertain process. This Article suggests first that both industry and government must fundamentally rethink their approaches to safety and develop a culture that encourages and facilitates learning from mistakes. Second, it identifies the phenomenon of [\*303] hollow government, characterized by government lacking the resources and authority to protect the public interest and a policy process dominated by powerful economic interests, as a root cause of the BP disaster and a contributing factor to other recent national disasters, including the financial crisis. Hollow government also makes it unlikely that we will learn the third meta-lesson and address the longstanding need for a coherent energy policy. These lessons could help to avert future disasters and better enable government to protect public health, safety, and the environment. However, absent changes to address the underlying obstacles to learning, there seems little likelihood that the lessons will be learned.

#### Passing OCS weakens safety reviews – causes more accidents

Goldstein 11—Director of Government Affairs @ Natural Resources Defense Council [Dr. David Goldstein (Former project director for the Bipartisan Policy Center), “Casting Oil Upon the Waters: The House Drilling Bills,” Switchboard, Posted May 2, 2011, pg. http://tinyurl.com/3syxpcl

This week, the House could vote on three bills to expand offshore oil and gas drilling. It is remarkable enough that the House would take up such measures before Congress has done a thing to make drilling safer. But what is truly astounding about these bills is that they would actually make the system that governs offshore drilling weaker than it was before the disaster in the Gulf of Mexico. This is legislation that should give pause even to the most ardent proponents of offshore drilling. These bills are more than a Big Oil wish list; they are a sort of oil utopia—and they could make sense only in a utopian world in which oil spills could never ever happen, in which there are never conflicts between the oil industry and other economic interests like fishing and tourism, and in which oil companies always take environmental and safety concerns fully into account. It’s as if Rep. Doc Hastings (R-WA), the bills’ sponsor, set out to prove how apt it is to talk about the U.S. “addiction” to oil. Under these bills, the U.S. would truly be acting like an addict, willing to sell out any principle, dispense with any caution, endanger any asset to get its next fix. Again, these bills ought to be seen as irresponsible even by supporters of increased drilling. So what would the bills actually do? Let’s start with the most egregious one of all, H.R. 1231. The bill is designed to ensure that oil drilling occurs off the East Coast from Maine to North Carolina, off the coast of Southern California and in the Arctic Ocean and Bristol Bay. That sweeping decision alone is breathtaking. But the bill does this by mandating that at least half the unleased area in each of those regions be put up for lease sales each and every time the government puts outer continental shelf territory up for lease. (Offshore territory available for lease is identified in five-year plans; the next one will cover 2012-2017.) Now think about that. The bill doesn’t simply reiterate that the government could make these areas available for oil drilling. It doesn’t just say that the government has to figure out which parts of those coastal waters would be appropriate for oil drilling and open those. It doesn’t even say that this administration has to open up a set amount of acreage for oil drilling, regardless of the specific concerns in any region. It says that, in perpetuity, each time waters are opened to drilling, at least half of the available acreage in each area needs to be opened up to drilling—until, presumably, every bit of acreage is being drilled. This is replacing oil policy with a kind of oil mania. Under this bill, neither this administration nor any future one could ever decide to limit drilling off the coast of New England, the Mid-Atlantic states, Southern California or Alaska because of economic or environmental concerns. No administration could decide to “take a breather” before opening up more leases to see how previously permitted activities were working out, or because there had been a spill, or because there was unexpected damage to the ecology or tourism, or because a state objected, or because there was no additional capacity to respond to an emergency, or because the agency overseeing drilling was too overwhelmed to properly review proposals. At least half the remaining unleased territory would have to be put up for leasing each and every time no matter what had happened, no matter what could happen, no matter what concerns states or scientists or fishermen or federal officials might have. The bill goes beyond earlier proposals to open up drilling, many of which had at least limited provisions for states to opt out of drilling off their states and which were not as prescriptive. The bill is titled “Reversing President Obama’s Offshore Moratorium Act,” demonstrating that partisan animus is behind this bill as much as any interest in energy. But the title is a misnomer in any event. The bill ought to be called “A bill to prevent any president or other official or the public from ever deciding not to drill for oil everywhere, no matter what the facts on the ground are.” Not so pithy, perhaps, but it’s what the bill actually does. The other two bills, while less sweeping—it would be just about impossible to be more sweeping—are based on the same compulsion to remove any judgment, discretion and balance from drilling decisions. H.R. 1230 mandates that the government conduct three lease sales in the next year—for oil and gas drilling in the central and western Gulf of Mexico and off the coast of Virginia. These are areas the administration decided not to lease after the Deepwater Horizon disaster. But as with H.R. 1231, the problem is not just opening up areas to oil and gas drilling. The bill short-circuits the environmental review for these sales. Specifically, the bill blocks court review of the Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) prepared for the lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico. It does this by having Congress deem that the EISs have met the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. This deeming, of course, is simply a political judgment, based on nothing more than the wish that it be so. (The Virginia lease is treated differently, apparently because the military may have concerns with it. For the sponsors, court reviews are only legitimate when someone they like is bringing a lawsuit.) Shutting down the courts is particularly wrongheaded in this instance for two reasons. First, the environmental review for these leases was done by the pre-Gulf disaster Minerals Management Service, an agency notorious for its close relationship to the oil industry. Second, these environmental reviews did not take into account the damage caused by the Deepwater Horizon blowout (and therefore what could happen under these leases) because such a disaster was thought of as impossible at the time. So under H.R. 1230, what is Congress’ reaction to the Gulf disaster? It is mandating that the administration and the courts act as if it had never happened. This ought to be a dictionary definition of irresponsibility. H.R. 1229 is another effort to make the review of oil and gas drilling weaker than it was before the Gulf disaster. The bill sets an arbitrary time limit of 30 days for reviewing drilling permit applications and grants automatic approvals if no action has been taken within 60 days. Was the message of the Gulf spill to ensure that safety reviews be shorter and conducted “under the gun”? In fact, the National Oil Spill Commission recommended that Congress extend another 30-day review limit—and that one didn’t even have an automatic approval provision. H.R. 1229 also tries to make it harder to challenge any oil drilling decision related to the Gulf of Mexico by eliminating the ability of those who challenge the federal government successfully from having their legal fees reimbursed. Current law does not encourage frivolous suits—the fees are only paid if the suit is successful—but it does enable citizen groups to challenge bad decisions. And H.R. 1229 also has provisions to stack the decks against any plaintiff who still manages to sue. So the first bills on drilling to come before the Republican-controlled House since the Gulf disaster try to wish away that catastrophic event. They would open almost all the waters of the U.S. to oil drilling; prevent any judgments from being made about where and when and how to drill; tie the hands of this and future administrations and the courts; and weaken the system of safety and environmental review. Quite a legacy. As my colleagues have noted, additional drilling will have no impact on gasoline prices. This is not a solution to our problems, it is a way to create new ones. This is a bill written by people who are so hell-bent on drilling that they can’t even admit that there are consequences to be considered. This is not policymaking; it’s a new kind of magical thinking.

#### The aff destroys the environment

DOW, 12, Defenders of Wildlife, "OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF DRILLING", https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=vandq=cache:0hRYuUTRu6wJ:www.defenders.org/publications/impacts\_of\_outer\_continental\_shelf\_drilling.pdf+andhl=enandgl=usandpid=blandsrcid=ADGEESimvF33YzLvIENzYCceMo6rbZBgGL\_qq52L3lPQbQp9oCH-vySHbDLITJDlQ61o\_\_xCzITqYc56OWssn5OEjL5C7HATlZWYsBP4Ec9SoxALLnh9Rk0NY\_ANjAdUgfb3vh0C-e31andsig=AHIEtbSgOUGu\_Q4pEWJM2fsBDGMuNjtfvA

Ocean Floor. Drilling infrastructure permanently alters ocean floor habitats. Drill rig footprints, undersea pipelines, dredging ship channels, and dumped drill cuttings-- the rock material dug out of the oil or gas well-- are often contaminated with drilling fluid used to lubricate and regulate the pressure in drilling operations. The fluid contains petroleum products and heavy metals. Strewn on the ocean floor, contaminated sediments can be carried by currents over a mile from the rig, sharply reducing populations of small bottom dwelling creatures that are important to the rest of the food chain and biomagnifying toxic contaminants in fish we eat.

### A2: Drilling Tech Safe

#### The drilling tech fails

Savitz 12, Jacqueline, Vice President of North American Oceans at Oceana, “Industry Won't Make Drilling Safe,” National Journal, , http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/04/what-more-can-be-done-to-ensur.php?comments=expandall#comments

The idea that offshore drilling safety and spill response have substantially improved is little more than a figment of some people’s imagination. In the question above, Michael Bromwich acknowledges that during the Deepwater Horizon disaster (DWH) safeguards were not effective, preparation was not adequate, and response tools were little better than they were 20 years ago. But what has really changed in the past two years? Sadly, not enough. Even the question itself, what the industry (private sector) can do to reduce risks, misses the point because it sidelines the needed government action to scale back drilling given the lack of sufficient safety and response options. Not to mention the lack of private sector solutions. Let’s look at the categories on the list: safeguards, preparations and response tools. Safeguards have barely changed. The last line of defense at the wellhead, the heavily relied upon blowout preventer (BOP), turns out to be flawed by design according to Det Norsk Veritas – not just the one on the Deepwater Horizon, but possibly the rest. Did the private sector fix that problem? Have BOPs been redesigned to be effective and replaced? No and no. So, there’s something the private sector could do, or rather should have done before resuming drilling. But it hasn’t been required and dangerous deep water drilling is already back in full swing. There are new testing and maintenance regulations for BOPs, but they don’t fix the underlying design flaw. So that means we need real improvements in the second category: preparations. Is industry more prepared now? Of course they are, just ask them. Their exploration plans brag about response times in days now, rather than the months that we are accustomed to. According to BP, if DWH happened again, it could plug a well in 2-3 weeks, much faster than the 3 months it took them last time. But what changed? Well, this time we are to assume the capping device will work -- except we really don’t know that. Just because it eventually worked on DWH doesn’t mean it will work next time on a different blowout with a differently oriented pipe or even a damaged wellhead. Maybe if the companies offered to pre-drill relief wells, then they could credibly promise a faster response. But the private sector isn’t offering that, and again, government hasn’t required it. So be ready for another 3-month ordeal. That takes us to response. It’s impossible to fully respond to a major spill. The DWH caused tremendous impacts on marine life and coastal economies. And the response tools are not much better now than they were 2 or even 20 years ago. We still rely on booms that don’t really work, and surface burns that may remove about 5% of the oil. And then there are always toxic dispersants that can be used to hide the problem, though they create new problems. As a result, the next spill will look like 2010 all over again. Response is little more than damage control.

#### Err on the side of irreversibility – even if it’s usually safe – accidents inevitably happen

DOW, 12, Defenders of Wildlife, "OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF DRILLING", https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=vandq=cache:0hRYuUTRu6wJ:www.defenders.org/publications/impacts\_of\_outer\_continental\_shelf\_drilling.pdf+andhl=enandgl=usandpid=blandsrcid=ADGEESimvF33YzLvIENzYCceMo6rbZBgGL\_qq52L3lPQbQp9oCH-vySHbDLITJDlQ61o\_\_xCzITqYc56OWssn5OEjL5C7HATlZWYsBP4Ec9SoxALLnh9Rk0NY\_ANjAdUgfb3vh0C-e31andsig=AHIEtbSgOUGu\_Q4pEWJM2fsBDGMuNjtfvA

Spills, Leaks and Catastrophes. Even with safety protocols in place, leaks and spills are inevitable— each year U.S. drilling operations send an average of 880,000 gallons of oil into the ocean. Then there are the unanticipated catastrophes. In 2005, Hurricanes Katrina and Rita destroyed 113 of the oil platforms in the Gulf of Mexico and damaged 457 pipelines. Hurricane damage caused at least 124 different spills, totaling over 17,700 barrels (743,000 gallons) of petroleum products. Oil is toxic to the plants and microscopic animals that form the basis of the marine food chain. It also poisons birds, mammals and fish. Those not killed outright can suffer a slow death from debilitating illness and injury.

#### It fractures the ocean floor

Pravica, 12, Michael Professor of Physics and Astronomy @ [University of Nevada](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Organizations/Schools/University+of+Nevada), Las Vegas, “Letters: Science, not profit, must lead deep water drilling,” USA Today, Updated 4/24/2012 8:43 PM , pg. http://tinyurl.com/9g8x28q

¶ There are a few critical points not mentioned in the USA TODAY editorial on the BP oil spill that should have been addressed ("[Editorial: 2 years after BP spill, lower risks](http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/editorials/story/2012-04-19/BP-Deepwater-oil-spill/54419466/1)"). First of all, deep water drilling represents a "brave new world" of oil exploration and novel technology as humans probe depths of water, oil and rock that sustain thousands of atmospheres of pressure. At these levels, the technology used to drill and extract oil can easily fail as we approach the yield strengths of many of the confining materials subjected to extreme conditions. There is also a high chance of significant fracture of the cean/sea floor in drilling and hole erosion from gushing, hot and high pressure oil (along with particulates and other mineral-rich fluids) that could make repair nearly impossible and could permanently poison our waters.¶ The greatest lesson from the BP oil spill is that politicians and businessmen cannot solve problems created by our advanced technology. Only scientists and engineers can. We must listen to them and adopt a more rational approach to drilling that places safety above profit.

**Weak regulations encourage unnecessary risks – causes accidents**

Flournoy 11—Professor and Director of the Environmental and Land Use Law Program @ University of Florida Levin College of Law [Alyson C. Flournoy, “ARTICLE: THREE META-LESSONS GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY SHOULD LEARN FROM THE BP DEEPWATER HORIZON DISASTER AND WHY THEY WILL NOT,” Boston College Environmental Affairs Law Review, 2011, 38 B.C. Envtl. Aff. L. Rev. 281

Although this Article's primary focus is on law and policy lessons, it is important to note that these highly visible and concrete failures will likely lead industry to respond voluntarily by adopting some practices and procedures to avoid similar failures. [n27](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n27) From a law and governance perspective, however, simply allowing industry to learn voluntarily and police itself is widely viewed as inadequate for several reasons. [n28](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n28) Indeed, the regulatory environment that existed at the time of the blowout relied  [\*286]  heavily on industry self-regulation. [n29](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n29) Investigation in the wake of the blowout has revealed that the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA)--the law governing development of federally owned oil and gas resources on the Outer Continental Shelf--included few standards to assure protection of health, safety, and the environment. [n30](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095#n30) Additionally, the Minerals Management Service's (MMS) approach to regulation under the OCSLA relied heavily on standards developed by and voluntarily agreed to by industry. [n31](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095#n31) Of course, even with this weak regulatory regime, the threat of tort liability should have provided industry with an incentive to take steps to avoid catastrophic risk. [n32](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095#n32) However, it seems clear from most accounts that BP and its contractors failed to accurately assess the severity of the risks they faced. [n33](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095#n33) Thus, relying on industry, market forces, and the tort liability system to deter similar conduct seems unwarranted and an abdication of government's role in protecting health, safety, and the environment.

### A2: Response Solves

#### No capacity or resources to respond or identify risks

Geman 12, “Report: Interior has ‘limited’ ability to gauge offshore drilling risks,” The Hill, 08/29/12 05:37 PM ET, pg. http://tinyurl.com/cmkjo9r

A [new report](http://gao.gov/products/GAO-12-423) by congressional auditors finds that the Interior Department still has “limited” ability to identify and evaluate risks from offshore drilling projects, despite overhauling and toughening oversight after the 2010 BP oil spill. “Interior continues to face challenges following its reorganization that may affect its ability to oversee oil and gas activities in the Gulf of Mexico. Specifically, Interior’s capacity to identify and evaluate risk remains limited, raising questions about the effectiveness with which it allocates its oversight resources,” the Government Accountability Office report states. The July 30 report made public Wednesday arrives as Republicans, at their national convention in Tampa, Fla., are [vowing to greatly expand](http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/245863-gop-platform-block-carbon-regs-expand-drilling) offshore access for oil-and-gas companies if Mitt Romney wins the White House. Interior, after the April 2010 spill began, announced it was dismantling its troubled Minerals Management Service and created what last year became separate agencies: The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management and the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement. The GAO report credits Interior with safety reforms but concludes, “the ultimate effectiveness of Interior’s reorganization and recent policy changes remains uncertain.” The report lists a number of areas of concern. For instance it alleges that environmental analyses of companies’ exploration and development plans have occurred “without the most current, potentially relevant information.” The report also lays out concerns with offshore regulators’ information management system and inspections program. “Interior’s inspections routinely identify violations, but Interior’s [Technical Information Management System] IT system is missing some data, such as the date that violations were found or corrected. As a result, Interior does not know on a real-time basis whether or when all violations were identified and corrected, potentially allowing unsafe conditions to continue for extended periods,” the report states.

### Oil Spills – Arctic

#### Oil spills kill Arctic biodiversity

O’Rourke 12, Ronal O’Rourke, specialist in naval affairs, June 15th, 2012, “Changes in the Arctic: Background and Issues for Congress” http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41153.pdf

No oil spill is entirely benign. **Even a** relatively minor spill**, depending on the timing and location, can cause significant harm to individual organisms and entire populations**. Regarding aquatic spills, marine mammals, birds, bottom-dwelling and intertidal species, and organisms in early developmental stages—eggs or larvae—are especially vulnerable. However, the effects of oil spills can vary greatly. Oil spills can cause impacts over a range of time scales, from only a few days to several years, or even decades in some cases. Conditions in the Arctic may have implications for toxicological effects that are not yet understood. For example, **oil spills on permafrost may persist in an ecosystem for relatively long periods of time, potentially harming plant life through their root systems**. Moreover, little is known about the effects of oil spills on species that are unique to the Arctic, particularly, species’ abilities to thrive in a cold environment and the effect temperature has on toxicity.94 The effects of oil spills in high latitude, cold ocean environments **may last longer and cause greater damage** than expected. Some recent studies have found that oil spills in lower latitudes have persisted for longer than initially expected, thus raising the concern that the persistence of oil in the Arctic may be understated. In terms of wildlife, population recovery may take longer in the Arctic because many of the species have longer life spans and reproduce at a slower rate.95

#### **Arctic ecosystems are uniquely key – solve extinction**

CAFF 98– Biodiversity Working group of the Arctic Council, Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna, September 1998, “Strategic Plan for the Conservation of Arctic Biological Diversity” http://arcticportal.org/uploads/RX/zN/RXzNc4KU8QKfhN\_KDw\_oQQ/The-StrategicPlanforTheConservofArcticBiolDiv.pdf

The **species of the Arctic are important** for their own sake and for their value, directly or indirectly, **to other parts of their ecosystems,** including humans(SIC). Of particular concern for conservation are **rare and endangered species**. CAFF’s inventories have identified 39 species and subspecies of rare and endangered birds and mammals and 96 species of rare endemic vascular plants (i.e., those with root systems) in the Arctic. In addition, several shared species, such as murres (guillemots) and eiders, have been targeted for co-operative action as species of common conservation concern. While these species may not be considered rare or endangered at a global level, **some populations may be seriously threatened at the local level in parts of the Arctic**. Out of the approximately 360 bird species that breed regularly in the Arctic region as defined by CAFF, 279 migrate out of the region and spend the winter in a non-Arctic country. In addition, **many Arctic plant species**are also found elsewhere, which may affect **their** overall genetic diversity**.** The conservation of these species may require co-operative efforts with non-Arctic countries.

#### Arctic oil spills lead to extinction

WWF 10 “Drilling for Oil in the Arctic Too Soon Too Risky” http://worldwildlife.org/publications/drilling-for-oil-in-the-arctic-too-soon-too-risky)

The Arctic and the subarctic regions surrounding it are important for many reasons. One is their enormous biological diversity: a kaleidoscopic array of land and seascapes supporting millions of migrating birds and charismatic species such as polar bears, walruses, narwhals and sea otters. Economics is another: Alaskan fisheries are among the richest in the world. Their $2.2 billion in annual catch fills the frozen food sections and seafood counters of supermarkets across the nation. However, there is another reason why the Arctic is not just important, but among the most important places on the face of the Earth. A keystone species is generally defined as one whose removal from an ecosystem triggers a cascade of changes affecting other species in that ecosystem. The same can be said of the Arctic in relation to the rest of the world. With feedback mechanisms that affect ocean currents and influence climate patterns, the Arctic functions like a global thermostat. Heat balance, ocean circulation patterns and the carbon cycle are all related to its regulatory and carbon storage functions. Disrupt these functions and we effect far-reaching changes in the conditions under which life has existed on Earth for thousands of years. In the context of climate change, the Arctic is a keystone ecosystem for the entire planet. Unfortunately, some of these disruptions are happening already as climate change melts sea ice and thaws the Arctic tundra. The Arctic’s sea ice cover reflects sunlight and therefore heat. As the ice melts, that heat is absorbed by the salt water, whose temperature, salinity and density all begin to change in ways that impact global ocean circulation patterns. On land, beneath the Arctic tundra, are immense pools of frozen methaneℐa greenhouse gas far more potent than carbon dioxide. As the tundra thaws, the risk of this methane escaping increases. 4 Were this to happen, the consequences would be dire and global in scope. As we continue not just to spill but to burn the fossil fuels that cause climate change, we are nudging the Arctic toward a meltdown that will make sea levels and temperatures rise even faster, with potentially catastrophic consequences for all life on Earth: no matter where one lives it. For the sake of the planet, losing the Arctic is not an option. Mitigating the impact of climate change there ultimately depends upon our getting serious about replacing fossil fuels with non-carbon-based renewable energies. Until we demonstrate the will and good sense to do that, however, the Arctic needs to be protected from other environmental threats that, compounded by the stress of climate change, undermine its resiliency and hasten its demise. Chief among those threats is offshore drilling ℐespecially in the absence of any credible and tested means of responding effectively to a major spill.

### A2: Environment Defense

#### Marine ecosystems are critical to the survival of all life on earth.

Craig 03 (Robin Kundis Craig, Associate Professor of Law, Indiana University School of Law, 34 McGeorge L. Rev. 155)

Biodiversity and ecosystem function arguments for conserving marine ecosystems also exist, just as they do for terrestrial ecosystems, but these arguments have thus far rarely been raised in political debates. For example, besides significant tourism values - the most economically valuable ecosystem service coral reefs provide, worldwide - coral reefs protect against storms and dampen other environmental fluctuations, services worth more than ten times the reefs' value for food production. n856 Waste treatment is another significant, non-extractive ecosystem function that intact coral reef ecosystems provide. n857 More generally, "ocean ecosystems play a major role in the global geochemical cycling of all the elements that represent the basic building blocks of living organisms, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, and sulfur, as well as other less abundant but necessary elements." n858 In a very real and direct sense, therefore, human degradation of marine ecosystems impairs the planet's ability to support life. Maintaining biodiversity is often critical to maintaining the functions of marine ecosystems**.** Current evidence shows that, in general, an ecosystem's ability to keep functioning in the face of disturbance is strongly dependent on its biodiversity, "indicating that more diverse ecosystems are more stable." n859 Coral reef ecosystems are particularly dependent on their biodiversity. [\*265] Most ecologists agree that the complexity of interactions and degree of interrelatedness among component species is higher on coral reefs than in any other marine environment. This implies that the ecosystem functioning that produces the most highly valued components is also complex and that many otherwise insignificant species have strong effects on sustaining the rest of the reef system. n860 Thus, maintaining and restoring the biodiversity of marine ecosystems is critical to maintaining and restoring the ecosystem services that they provide. Non-use biodiversity values for marine ecosystems have been calculated in the wake of marine disasters, like the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska. n861 Similar calculations could derive preservation values for marine wilderness. However, economic value, or economic value equivalents, should not be "the sole or even primary justification for conservation of ocean ecosystems. Ethical arguments also have considerable force and merit." n862 At the forefront of such arguments should be a recognition of how little we know about the sea - and about the actual effect of human activities on marine ecosystems. The United States has traditionally failed to protect marine ecosystems because it was difficult to detect anthropogenic harm to the oceans, but we now know that such harm is occurring - even though we are not completely sure about causation or about how to fix every problem. Ecosystems like the NWHI coral reef ecosystem should inspire lawmakers and policymakers to admit that most of the time we really do not know what we are doing to the sea and hence should be preserving marine wilderness whenever we can - especially when the United States has within its territory relatively pristine marine ecosystems that may be unique in the world. We may not know much about the sea, but we do know this much: if we kill the ocean we kill ourselves, and we will take most of the biosphere with us. The Black Sea is almost dead, n863 its once-complex and productive ecosystem almost entirely replaced by a monoculture of comb jellies, "starving out fish and dolphins, emptying fishermen's nets, and converting the web of life into brainless, wraith-like blobs of jelly." n864 More importantly, the Black Sea is not necessarily unique. The Black Sea is a microcosm of what is happening to the ocean systems at large. The stresses piled up: overfishing, oil spills, industrial discharges, nutrient pollution, wetlands destruction, the introduction of an alien species. The sea weakened, slowly at first, then collapsed with [\*266] shocking suddenness. The lessons of this tragedy should not be lost to the rest of us, because much of what happened here is being repeated all over the world. The ecological stresses imposed on the Black Sea were not unique to communism. Nor, sadly, was the failure of governments to respond to the emerging crisis. n865 Oxygen-starved "dead zones" appear with increasing frequency off the coasts of major cities and major rivers, forcing marine animals to flee and killing all that cannot. n866 Ethics as well as enlightened self-interest thus suggest that the United States should protect fully-functioning marine ecosystems wherever possible - even if a few fishers go out of business as a result.

## Russia DA

### 1NC

The plan causes Russian political instability and eliminates Putin influence

Blackwill and O’Sullivan, 14 Robert D., Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy, and Meghan L., Jeane Kirkpatrick Professor of the Practice of International Affairs and Director of the Geopolitics of Energy Project at Harvard, “America’s Energy Edge: The Geopolitical Consequences of the Shale Revolution,” <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/140750/robert-d-blackwill-and-meghan-l-osullivan/americas-energy-edge>, ALB

The most dramatic possible geopolitical consequence of the North American energy boom is that the increase in U.S. and Canadian oil production could disrupt the global price of oil -- which could fall by 20 percent or more. Today, the price of oil is determined largely by the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries, which regulates production levels among its member states. When there are unexpected production disruptions, OPEC countries (primarily Saudi Arabia) try to stabilize prices by ramping up their production, which reduces the global amount of spare production capacity. When spare capacity falls below two million barrels per day, the market gets jittery, and oil prices tend to spike upward. When the market sees spare capacity rise above roughly six million barrels a day, prices tend to fall. For the past five years or so, OPEC’s members have attempted to balance the need to fill their public coffers with the need to supply enough oil to keep the global economy humming, and they have managed to keep the price of oil at around $90 to $110 per barrel.¶ As additional North American oil floods the market, OPEC’s ability to control prices will be challenged. According to projections from the U.S. Energy Information Administration, between 2012 and 2020, the United States is expected to produce more than three million barrels of new petroleum and other liquid fuels each day, mainly from light tight oil. These new volumes, plus new supplies coming on line from Iraq and elsewhere, could cause a glut in supply, which would push prices down -- especially as global oil demand shrinks due to improved efficiency or slower economic growth. In that event, OPEC could have a hard time maintaining discipline among its members, few of which are willing to curb their oil production in the face of burgeoning social demands and political uncertainty. Persistently lower prices would create shortfalls in the revenues they need to fund their expenditures.¶ If oil prices fall and stay low, every government in the world that relies on hydrocarbon revenues will find itself under stress. Countries feeling the pinch will include Indonesia and Vietnam in Asia; Kazakhstan and Russia in Eurasia; Colombia, Mexico, and Venezuela in Latin America; Angola and Nigeria in Africa; and Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia in the Middle East. These countries’ abilities to endure such fiscal setbacks vary and would depend in part on how long low prices lasted. Even with a more moderate drop in prices, the increased volume and diversity of the oil supply would benefit energy consumers worldwide. Countries that like to use their energy supplies for foreign policy purposes -- usually in ways that run counter to U.S. interests -- will see their influence shrink.¶ Of all the governments likely to be hit hard, Moscow has the most to lose. Although Russia possesses large reserves of shale oil that it could eventually develop, the global supply shift will weaken the country in the short term. The influx of North American gas to the market will not entirely free the rest of Europe from Russia’s influence, since Russia will remain the continent’s largest energy supplier. But additional suppliers will give European customers leverage they can use to negotiate better terms with Russian producers, as they managed to do in 2010 and 2011. Europe will gain most from the change if it further integrates its natural gas market and builds more LNG terminals to import gas; such moves could help it ward off crises like those that occurred when Russia cut off gas supplies to Ukraine in 2006 and 2009. The development of Europe’s own considerable shale resources would help even more.¶ A sustained drop in the price of oil, meanwhile, could destabilize Russia’s political system. Even with the current price near $100 per barrel, the Kremlin has scaled back its official expectations of annual economic growth over the coming decade to around 1.8 percent and begun to make budget cuts. If prices fall further, Russia could exhaust its stabilization fund, which would force it to make draconian budget reductions. Russian President Vladimir Putin’s influence could diminish, creating new openings for his political opponents at home and making Moscow look weak abroad.

**Putin collapse causes wars in Chechnya, the Caucuses, ethnic cleansing, and civil war**

**Arnold, 12**, Richard, associate professor of political science at Muskingum University “Is Russia Stable Without Putin?” Eurasia Daily Monitor Volume: 9 Issue: 34, Jamestown Foundation

¶ Judging from the posts left on nationalist websites – some of which are hosted outside the country due to the Kremlin’s clampdown on these organizations and enforcement of article 282 (prohibiting incitement of national, racial or religious enmity) of the Russian constitution, which began at the end of 2010 (Sova report, 2011) – the extreme nationalists have decided to put aside their differences with the liberals and the left in the name of getting rid of “the corrupt junta of Putin” (http://dpni.org/articles/novostnaya/29030/). It should be stressed that this may not result in a decrease in skinhead attacks on ethnic minorities, as most skinhead groups are not aligned with any formal organization. This temporary halt to hostilities or ceasefire has been mirrored by the leader of the so-called “Caucasus Emirate” Doku Umarov’s pledge to stop attacking Russian civilians for the duration of the protests (http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/chechen-terror-leader-halts-civilian-attacks-6358877.html).¶ Given that the terrorist campaign of Chechen and now Islamist rebels has been continuous since the Moscow apartment bombings of 1999, Umarov’s statement is extremely significant. This coalescence of diametrically opposed groups around a common goal is remarkable in post-Soviet politics.¶ Looking further down the line, however, **the alliance of liberals, communists and nationalists appears** to be solely **a marriage of convenience that will not last beyond** the honeymoon of **Putin’s departure**. It is unknown what might happen to a Russia without Putin. In an open letter to Nezavisimaya Gazeta on January 23, Vladimir Putin warned that the protests against the fraudulent elections of December 4 and the slogans of the protestors such as “stop feeding the Caucasus” could lead Russia to follow the same fate as the Soviet Union. Some commentators have seen in this an attempt by Putin to scare the protestors into supporting him. Yet the threat of secession remains a possibility, especially given Russian nationalists’ desire to introduce laws protecting ethnic Russians – 80 percent of the population – within Russia. The extreme nationalists have reacted hopefully to this, with Alexander Belov seeing in the protests to remove Putin the chance to finish the state-building project begun with the fall of the Soviet Union and create an ethnic state for Russians (http://dpni.org/articles/novosti\_\_d/28502/). With 59 percent of respondents either strongly or moderately in favor of the phrase “Russia for Russians” in November 2011, there is also widespread support for ideas like these within Russia (http://www.levada.ru/15-12-2011/rossiyane-ob-obstanovke-na-severnom-kavkaze-natsionalizme-politike-i-finansirovanii-regio).¶ **Such laws would** almost certainly **be deleterious for** the future of **the Russian Federation as a single country.** At a minimum, discriminatory laws would further radicalize separatists in the North Caucasus. Indeed, that may even be part of Umarov’s calculus in calling a ceasefire to the terrorist campaign. It is also possible that under any kind of genuine democracy in Russia, the North Caucasus would vote to secede along the lines of the “Velvet Divorce” in 1993. Further afield, Putin’s fears that more than the integrity of Russia’s south would be a stake are not altogether fanciful. Tatarstan and the Far East are obvious candidates for separatism and such forces there would be buoyed by separation in the North Caucasus and discriminatory laws from Moscow.¶ It is also clear, however, that the **extreme nationalists would not welcome such separation.** Indeed, Dmitry Demushkin stated in an interview with Interfax on January 23 that “Russian nationalists will never support the separation of Russia, supporting conversely the wellbeing of Russians – the preservation of the natural native nations, living on the territory of our country” (www.demushkin.com/content/news). Such rhetoric should not be taken lightly. Over the last 12 years, extreme nationalists and Neo-Nazis have been acting as virtual paramilitaries who claim to be defending indigenous Russian culture and “the white race,” by sending recruits through military training programs and attacking ethnic minorities on an almost daily basis. Despite increased police attention to such crimes, there were at least five incidences of violent assault in December 2011 alone (http://www.sova-center.ru/en/xenophobia/news-releases/2012/01/d23381/). How much worse such violence would be in a potentially anarchic situation where the police are not prosecuting crimes is hard to say. While it may be alarmist to raise the specter of Civil War at this stage, **no-one should take this scenario of Civil War off the table.**

**Conflict in Chechnya that goes nuclear**

**Blank 01**, Professor of Research, Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, [MacArthur, Winter, online: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_qa3996/is\_200101/ai\_n8951462/print Russian military officials… advocated limited nuclear war.66 http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_qa3996/is\_200101/ai\_n8951462/print]

These political threat assessments invoke NATO and the United States as authors of growing threats and define the international situation in terms of the threat U.S. unipolarity poses to Russia's cherished multipolar world. The various doctrinal documents also expand parameters for first-strike use of nuclear weapons and urge vastly increased defense spending; the draft doctrine calculates that spending, as in Soviet times, on the basis of what the military claims to need rather than what Russia can afford.61 Russian military officials and analysts also told me in June 1999 that NATO's Kosovo campaign led doctrine writers to include provisions for deploying tactical nuclear weapons in unspecified conventional threat scenarios.62 In December 1999, Moscow confirmed this when the commander in chief of the Strategic Nuclear Forces, General Vladimir Yakovlev, admitted that Moscow had to lower the threshold of conflict wherein it might **launch a first-strike nuclear attack** because it could not otherwise defend against local wars and conflicts, a category that could be stretched to include Chechnya.63 The security concept reiterated his statements, overtly expressing Russia's strategy of deterrence and nuclear warfighting for limited and unlimited nuclear war.64 Other authoritative statements by Deputy Defense Minister Vladimir Mikhailov confirm the trend toward nuclear warfighting for limited and unlimited nuclear war scenarios and announce Moscow's belief that it can control such situations despite forty years of Soviet argument that no such control was feasible.65 Indeed, the national security concept openly advocated **limited nuclear war**.66

### Instability Impact Extensions

**Caucus instability causes nuclear war**

Stephen **Blank 98**, MacArthur Professor of Research at the Strategic Studies Institute of the US Army War College, Jane’s Intelligence Review, 5-1-98

Many of the conditions for conventional war or protracted ethnic conflict in which third parties intervene are present in the Transcaucasus. For example, many Third World conflicts generated by local structural factors have a great potential for unintended escalation. Big powers often feel obliged to rescue their lesser proteges and proxies. One or another big power may fail to grasp the other side's stakes, since interests here are not as clear as in Europe. Hence commitments involving the use of nuclear weapons to prevent a client's defeat are not well established or clear as in Europe. Clarity about the nature of the threat could prevent the kind of rapid and almost uncontrolled escalation we saw in 1993 when Turkish noises about intervening on behalf of Azerbaijan led Russian leaders to threaten a nuclear war in that case. Precisely because Turkey is a NATO ally but probably could not prevail in a long war against Russia - or if it could, would trigger a potential nuclear blow (not a small possibility given the erratic nature of Russia's declared nuclear strategies) - the danger of major war is higher here than almost everywhere else.

**Civil war goes nuclear**

**David 99**, (Prof Poli Sci – Johns Hopkins University, Steven, *Foreign Affairs*, Jan/Feb)

AT NO TIME since the civil war of 1918 -- 20 has Russia been closer to bloody conflict than it is today. The fledgling government confronts a vast array of problems without the power to take effective action. For 70 years, the Soviet Union operated a strong state apparatus, anchored by the KGB and the Communist Party. Now its disintegration has created a power vacuum that has yet to be filled. Unable to rely on popular ideology or coercion to establish control, the government must prove itself to the people and establish its authority on the basis of its performance. But the Yeltsin administration has abjectly failed to do so, and it cannot meet the most basic needs of the Russian people. Russians know they can no longer look to the state for personal security, law enforcement, education, sanitation, health care, or even electrical power. In the place of government authority, criminal groups -- the Russian Mafia -- increasingly hold sway. Expectations raised by the collapse of communism have been bitterly disappointed, and Moscow's inability to govern coherently raises the specter of civil unrest. If internal war does strike Russia, economic deterioration will be a prime cause. From 1989 to the present, the GDP has fallen by 50 percent. In a society where, ten years ago, unemployment scarcely existed, it reached 9.5 percent in 1997 with many economists declaring the true figure to be much higher. Twenty-two percent of Russians live below the official poverty line (earning less than $ 70 a month). Modern Russia can neither collect taxes (it gathers only half the revenue it is due) nor significantly cut spending. Reformers tout privatization as the country's cure-all, but in a land without well-defined property rights or contract law and where subsidies remain a way of life, the prospects for transition to an American-style capitalist economy look remote at best. As the massive devaluation of the ruble and the current political crisis show, Russia's condition is even worse than most analysts feared. If conditions get worse, even the stoic Russian people will soon run out of patience. A future conflict would quickly draw in Russia's military. In the Soviet days civilian rule kept the powerful armed forces in check. But with the Communist Party out of office, what little civilian control remains relies on an exceedingly fragile foundation -- personal friendships between government leaders and military commanders. Meanwhile, the morale of Russian soldiers has fallen to a dangerous low. Drastic cuts in spending mean inadequate pay, housing, and medical care. A new emphasis on domestic missions has created an ideological split between the old and new guard in the military leadership, increasing the risk that disgruntled generals may enter the political fray and feeding the resentment of soldiers who dislike being used as a national police force. Newly enhanced ties between military units and local authorities pose another danger. Soldiers grow ever more dependent on local governments for housing, food, and wages. Draftees serve closer to home, and new laws have increased local control over the armed forces. Were a conflict to emerge between a regional power and Moscow, it is not at all clear which side the military would support. Divining the military's allegiance is crucial, however, since the structure of the Russian Federation makes it virtually certain that regional conflicts will continue to erupt. Russia's 89 republics, krais, and oblasts grow ever more independent in a system that does little to keep them together. As the central government finds itself unable to force its will beyond Moscow (if even that far), power devolves to the periphery. With the economy collapsing, republics feel less and less incentive to pay taxes to Moscow when they receive so little in return. Three-quarters of them already have their own constitutions, nearly all of which make some claim to sovereignty. Strong ethnic bonds promoted by shortsighted Soviet policies may motivate non-Russians to secede from the Federation. Chechnya's successful revolt against Russian control inspired similar movements for autonomy and independence throughout the country. If these rebellions spread and Moscow responds with force, civil war is likely. Should Russia succumb to internal war, the consequences for the United States and Europe will be severe. A major power like Russia -- even though in decline -- does not suffer civil war quietly or alone. An embattled Russian Federation might provoke opportunistic attacks from enemies such as China. Massive flows of refugees would pour into central and western Europe. Armed struggles in Russia could easily spill into its neighbors. Damage from the fighting, particularly attacks on nuclear plants, would poison the environment of much of Europe and Asia. Within Russia, the consequences would be even worse. Just as the sheer brutality of the last Russian civil war laid the basis for the privations of Soviet communism, a second civil war might produce another horrific regime. Most alarming is the real possibility that the violent disintegration of Russia could lead to loss of control over its nuclear arsenal. No nuclear state has ever fallen victim to civil war, but even without a clear precedent the grim consequences can be foreseen. Russia retains some 20,000 nuclear weapons and the raw material for tens of thousands more, in scores of sites scattered throughout the country. So far, the government has managed to prevent the loss of any weapons or much material. If war erupts, however, Moscow's already weak grip on nuclear sites will slacken, making weapons and supplies available to a wide range of anti-American groups and states. Such dispersal of nuclear weapons represents the greatest physical threat America now faces. And it is hard to think of anything that would increase this threat more than the chaos that would follow a Russian civil war.

### 2NC Link Cards

**Ramped up U.S. gas production brings down Putin even if they don’t completely block Russia out**

**Berry 12** (has covered Russian politics for CBS News since 1995, 3/6**/**’12. Lynn, “Analysis: Putin faces steep challenge in protests,” CBS News Opinion)

How Putin responds to the challenge, and whether he can stop the protests from spreading, will play a **crucial** role in determining the fate of his new term as president and **of Russia itself.**¶The factors that will shape the nation's future:¶ PUTIN FATIGUE: Evidence of vote-rigging to save Putin's unpopular party from defeat in a December election set off a series of unprecedented protests. Long-stirring anger among young professionals and what has become known as the "creative class" was no longer confined to the Internet, but on display on the streets of Moscow and other cities. Protest rallies became a celebration of this newfound sense of community and purpose. The protesters are tired of the corruption Putin has fostered and the stifling political system that has deprived them of a voice in how their country is governed.¶ Mostly, though, they are just tired of Putin.¶ PUTIN'S CHOICE: Now that his return to the Kremlin is secured, the big question is how Putin will respond to the protests and the deeper grievances they represent. Will he tighten the screws or follow through on promises of political reform? His actions so far suggest he will try to do both. It will be a difficult balancing act. If he cracks down too hard on the opposition, or tries to control the Internet or the independent broadcasters that have become platforms for free discussion, he could incite further anger. Ditto if his political reforms turn out to be just window dressing. But if Putin genuinely opens up the political system, he risks losing control over parliament and the governors who rule in his name across the vast country. WHITHER THE PROTESTS: The protesters say Putin's promises to restore elections for governors and to allow opposition parties to take part in parliamentary elections are proof that they can be a force for change. They vow to keep up the pressure out on the streets. But it is not clear that they can maintain momentum now that the election is over. The mood at a protest on Monday was gloomier, and several hundred activists provoked a police crackdown by trying to occupy the central square after it was over. Some of the opposition leaders are becoming more confrontational, which could undermine the unity of a peaceful movement that has allowed liberals, leftists and nationalists to make common cause. On a more positive note, the protest movement may be giving rise to a new civic activism, as shown by the tens of thousands of volunteers who served as poll monitors during Sunday's election. The movement also has encouraged some people who planned to leave the country to stay and do their part to make Russia a better place for themselves and their children.¶ WHAT COULD BRING PUTIN DOWN: Putin has made no attempt to reach the new generation of educated, urban Russians and doesn't seem to know how. Even his humor, often crude and filled with references to old Soviet films, falls flat. He appears to be betting that he can contain the protesters' anger and prevent them from broadening their appeal. **The danger to Putin is the** Russian **economy**, still **dependent on exports of** oil and **gas** despite grand plans to modernize industry. **To consolidate his support** ahead of the election, **Putin threw money at all sectors of the population, promising billions** of dollars in new spending that will severely strain the budget. **If Putin doesn't deliver, his** support **base may turn against him.** And if the workers, teachers and government employees who were bused to Putin's campaign rallies decide to join the opposition protests instead, **he's doomed.**

#### Energy wealth is key

Fin, 12 Al, writer for oilprice, an energy news site that contributes energy analysis to Business Insider and Forbes, <http://oilprice.com/Energy/Natural-Gas/Gazproms-Future-Dependent-on-Arctic-Energy-Riches.html> \*\*Gazprom is a company that extracts naturalgas

The continued existence of Russia as a transcontinental power depends on its ability to leverage vast energy wealth into political stability and power**.** Without energy wealth, Russia begins to disintegrate. A giant new gas field north of the Arctic Circle provides some hope for Russia's future.¶ Gazprom’s mammoth tax payments bolster the Russian economy, allowing the Kremlin to dole out subsidies and keep a lid on popular discontent.¶ At the same time, Gazprom faces challenges that threaten not just its dominance of the world’s natural gas market, but also the stability of Russia itself., the emergence of U.S. shale gas and the rise of liquefied natural gas super tankers are transforming the global gas market, providing alternatives to Russian supply. The company’s close association with the Kremlin, historically an asset and a hindrance, may invite greater scrutiny as domestic opposition to Putin’s rule grows. European clients and parliaments are contesting Gazprom’s continental influence with greater solidarity than ever before. A recent Morgan Stanley (MS) report determined that these tests may “leave Gazprom running a very different business,” diminished in scale and profitability and less favoured at home.¶ That’s why so much is riding on Bovanenkovo. Beneath two feet of permafrost on the distant Yamal Peninsula, 1,500 miles northeast of Moscow, Bovanenkovo holds nearly five trillion cubic meters of gas. The field will begin delivering gas in July and for the next 35 years could on its own produce enough to meet 25 percent of European demand. Bovanenkovo affords the Kremlin peace of mind, although the price tag for its development—upward of $100 billion—allows Gazprom little margin for error. \_BW¶ The emergence of abundant tight gas reserves in North America, South America, China, the Levant, parts of Europe, and Southeast Asia suggests that in the not-too-distant future, reduced demand is likely to shake global gas markets even further. Russia will be forced to move to gas to liquids (GTL) production in order to convert its less valued gas into more valued liquids.¶ Gazprom performs many functions traditionally reserved for the state, including funding public works projects directly from its budget. It’s the only Russian company that is compelled to pay its tax bill monthly, since this revenue makes up the single largest portion of Russian gross domestic product (10 percent) and is critical to the basic workings of government. Gazprom is less a company than a public trust, one that enjoys special advantages in exchange for fulfilling official wishes.¶ ...Europe’s dependence on Gazprom for natural gas gives the Kremlin power to leave millions in the cold should it choose to do so (as it did to Ukraine after pricing disputes in 2006 and 2009). A deep freeze in Russia this winter has increased domestic demand for fuel, producing a shortfall in natural gas supply to Europe. Over the last year, as European customers have been squeezed by surging gas prices (generating Gazprom’s record earnings), some of Gazprom’s Western clients have demanded arbitration. European Union antitrust investigators stormed Gazprom offices in Germany and the Czech Republic, seizing contracts. (Gazprom insists its contracts adhere to international law.) And officials in Brussels are debating the Third Energy Package, anti-monopoly legislation focused squarely on Gazprom’s ability both to transport and sell gas in the territory of the EU.¶ ...Czarist-era geologists discovered gas on the Yamal Peninsula just before the 1917 Russian Revolution, though they didn’t possess the wherewithal to extract it. Through the years, the litany of upheaval that is Russia’s burden prevented the exploitation of such an asset. Engineers discovered the Bovanenkovo field in 1971, three years after the death of Vadim Bovanenko, a geophysicist who had served as the head of Yamal Oil and Gas Exploration, an arm of the gas ministry. But it was only under Putin that workers were finally able to begin building infrastructure at Bovanenkovo in 2007. The date for initial gas delivery was postponed on several occasions, causing observers to wonder if the project would ever be realized. The start-up date was then pushed up to July 2012, sparking a new round of questions. Did Gazprom foresee a spike in European demand? Were Nadym’s gas fields in far worse shape than anyone had imagined? It’s hard to know why Gazprom behaves the way it does. Company executives aren’t known for sharing information. Several Gazprom officials replied politely to my interview requests but provided little revelatory insight.¶ Sharing profits, however, is part of being a national champion. In the last year, Gazprom has slashed investments and more than doubled dividends, increasing the yield of the Russian stock market and padding state coffers. As Putin prepares to reassume the presidency for what could be another 12 years, his ruling United Russia party increasingly turns to Gazprom, less to wield power abroad than to shore up support at home. In October, Gazprom absorbed a selective doubling of the tax levied for the extraction of mineral resources, which will result in $10 billion of lost profits this year. This money will help balance the Russian budget and pay for popular social programs. \_BW¶ Gazprom is a central pillar of Putin's power. But globally, the gas industry is changing, moving on to new technologies and new sources of natural gas. If Russia is unable to keep up, it will be left behind once again.¶ That would be dangerous for the wounded bear, currently struggling with low morale, capital flight, and demographic collapse. The potential conflict between China and Russia over the mineral wealth of Eastern Siberia looms larger in the distance with every weakening that Moscow experiences.

### Putin Collapse Impact Extensions

**Putin collapse causes wars in Chechnya, the Caucuses, ethnic cleansing, and civil war**

**Arnold, 12**, Richard, associate professor of political science at Muskingum University “Is Russia Stable Without Putin?” Eurasia Daily Monitor Volume: 9 Issue: 34, Jamestown Foundation

¶ Judging from the posts left on nationalist websites – some of which are hosted outside the country due to the Kremlin’s clampdown on these organizations and enforcement of article 282 (prohibiting incitement of national, racial or religious enmity) of the Russian constitution, which began at the end of 2010 (Sova report, 2011) – the extreme nationalists have decided to put aside their differences with the liberals and the left in the name of getting rid of “the corrupt junta of Putin” (http://dpni.org/articles/novostnaya/29030/). It should be stressed that this may not result in a decrease in skinhead attacks on ethnic minorities, as most skinhead groups are not aligned with any formal organization. This temporary halt to hostilities or ceasefire has been mirrored by the leader of the so-called “Caucasus Emirate” Doku Umarov’s pledge to stop attacking Russian civilians for the duration of the protests (http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/chechen-terror-leader-halts-civilian-attacks-6358877.html).¶ Given that the terrorist campaign of Chechen and now Islamist rebels has been continuous since the Moscow apartment bombings of 1999, Umarov’s statement is extremely significant. This coalescence of diametrically opposed groups around a common goal is remarkable in post-Soviet politics.¶ Looking further down the line, however, **the alliance of liberals, communists and nationalists appears** to be solely **a marriage of convenience that will not last beyond** the honeymoon of **Putin’s departure**. It is unknown what might happen to a Russia without Putin. In an open letter to Nezavisimaya Gazeta on January 23, Vladimir Putin warned that the protests against the fraudulent elections of December 4 and the slogans of the protestors such as “stop feeding the Caucasus” could lead Russia to follow the same fate as the Soviet Union. Some commentators have seen in this an attempt by Putin to scare the protestors into supporting him. Yet the threat of secession remains a possibility, especially given Russian nationalists’ desire to introduce laws protecting ethnic Russians – 80 percent of the population – within Russia. The extreme nationalists have reacted hopefully to this, with Alexander Belov seeing in the protests to remove Putin the chance to finish the state-building project begun with the fall of the Soviet Union and create an ethnic state for Russians (http://dpni.org/articles/novosti\_\_d/28502/). With 59 percent of respondents either strongly or moderately in favor of the phrase “Russia for Russians” in November 2011, there is also widespread support for ideas like these within Russia (http://www.levada.ru/15-12-2011/rossiyane-ob-obstanovke-na-severnom-kavkaze-natsionalizme-politike-i-finansirovanii-regio).¶ **Such laws would** almost certainly **be deleterious for** the future of **the Russian Federation as a single country.** At a minimum, discriminatory laws would further radicalize separatists in the North Caucasus. Indeed, that may even be part of Umarov’s calculus in calling a ceasefire to the terrorist campaign. It is also possible that under any kind of genuine democracy in Russia, the North Caucasus would vote to secede along the lines of the “Velvet Divorce” in 1993. Further afield, Putin’s fears that more than the integrity of Russia’s south would be a stake are not altogether fanciful. Tatarstan and the Far East are obvious candidates for separatism and such forces there would be buoyed by separation in the North Caucasus and discriminatory laws from Moscow.¶ It is also clear, however, that the **extreme nationalists would not welcome such separation.** Indeed, Dmitry Demushkin stated in an interview with Interfax on January 23 that “Russian nationalists will never support the separation of Russia, supporting conversely the wellbeing of Russians – the preservation of the natural native nations, living on the territory of our country” (www.demushkin.com/content/news). Such rhetoric should not be taken lightly. Over the last 12 years, extreme nationalists and Neo-Nazis have been acting as virtual paramilitaries who claim to be defending indigenous Russian culture and “the white race,” by sending recruits through military training programs and attacking ethnic minorities on an almost daily basis. Despite increased police attention to such crimes, there were at least five incidences of violent assault in December 2011 alone (http://www.sova-center.ru/en/xenophobia/news-releases/2012/01/d23381/). How much worse such violence would be in a potentially anarchic situation where the police are not prosecuting crimes is hard to say. While it may be alarmist to raise the specter of Civil War at this stage, **no-one should take this scenario of Civil War off the table.**

### Putin Collapse-Alaska Scenario

**Putin contains overreaching nationalism**

**Weir, 12,** writer for CSM, “Vladimir Putin's presidential campaign and ethnic Russian nationalism”

While analysts say many of Putin's ideas sound OK, a few are head-scratchers, such as his call for a crackdown on internal migrants whose behavior displays an "inappropriate, aggressive, defiant, or disrespectful" attitude toward the culture and customs of the majority. "This behavior should be met with a legal, but harsh response," he wrote.¶ "One has an unpleasant reaction to this article," says Lev Ponomaryov, head of For Human Rights, a Moscow-based grassroots movement. "Some of it sounds like cheap populism aimed at stealing the thunder of nationalist groups who are now in opposition to his regime."¶ Putin's logic is not fully spelled out, leaving dangerous ambiguities, Mr. Ponomaryov adds. "For example, his idea that Russians are, historically, the 'state-forming' people could be interpreted different ways, and could be easily abused. It could become a rationale for having more ethnic Russians in high posts, for instance. If we heard these words out of the mouth of an avowed nationalist politician, it [would] be truly scary," Mr. Ponomaryov says.¶ On the other hand, Putin attacked key some Russian nationalist positions, including the demand that the Russian government cut off economic subsidies to the impoverished North Caucasus. Putin ridiculed that idea, which is strongly supported by popular blogger and opposition leader Alexei Navalny, as the kind of destructive thinking that led straight to the collapse of the Soviet Union two decades ago.¶ "Putin's basic idea is that different nations can exist [within Russia], but there is no chance for them to enjoy self-determination. Also, Russia should be as big as possible," says Nikolai Petrov, an expert with the Carnegie Center in Moscow.¶ "It's basically a position in favor of imperialism and Russian chauvinism, and **that will appeal to nationalists**.… **Putin is trying to play the nationalist card, but mainly to keep it from slipping out of his control."**

**They’ll invade Alaska – triggers war**

**Shahi 12**, reporter, <http://www.thesundayindian.com/en/story/Vladimir-Zhirinovsky-A-clown-or-a-Neo-Fascist/117/31070/>

In an election that is simultaneously being labelled “boring” and “pre-decided”, there is at least someone who makes for an interesting copy. Vladimir Zhirinovsky is not new to the Russian political landscape. In fact, among the fellow contenders his political capital appears to be the oldest. Liberal Democratic Party of Russia that he represents was the first political party to be allowed during the later days of Glasnost. It was variously suggested that the party was the brainchild Communist Party and KGB. Zhirinovsky was its first presidential candidate and has been losing elections since then, with an exception of 2004 when he declined the candidature in favour of his bodyguard. ¶ An animated nationalist, he is infamous for slandering his political opponents, instigating physical brawls in the parliament and diatribes against the West in general and Jews in particular. His hatred for Israel is only surpassed by his hatred for Britain whom he accuses of every major war that has been fought in the 20th century. Zhirinovsky caters to **the right-wing crowd** and knows how to offer fodder for domestic consumption. In this regard, he is not different from other right-wing loose heads of Europe. However, what makes him a class apart is the seriousness and conviction with which he makes most of his assertions. Even the choicest mention of such comments can fill a broadsheet; a few nerve-wrecking ones can be quoted here. In the past, he has advocated using tactical nuclear weapons against Chechens, **forcibly annexing Alaska from the US** and putting the Ukrainians away and legalizing polygamy.

### Lashout Scenario

#### Causes lashout

Blackwill and O’Sullivan, 14 Robert D., Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy, and Meghan L., Jeane Kirkpatrick Professor of the Practice of International Affairs and Director of the Geopolitics of Energy Project at Harvard, “America’s Energy Edge: The Geopolitical Consequences of the Shale Revolution,” <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/140750/robert-d-blackwill-and-meghan-l-osullivan/americas-energy-edge>, ALB

Although the West might welcome the thought of Russia under such strain, a weaker Russia will not necessarily mean a less challenging Russia. Moscow is already trying to compensate for losses in Europe by making stronger inroads into Asia and the global LNG market, and it will have every reason to actively counter Europe’s efforts to develop its own resources. Indeed, Russia’s state-run media, the state-owned gas company Gazprom, and even Putin himself have warned of the environmental dangers of fracking in Europe -- which is, as The Guardian has put it, “an odd phenomenon in a country that usually keeps ecological concerns at the bottom of its agenda.” To discourage European investment in the infrastructure needed to import LNG, Russia may also preemptively offer its European customers more favorable gas deals, as it did for Ukraine at the end of 2013. More dramatically, should low energy prices undermine Putin and empower more nationalist forces in the country, Russia could seek to secure its regional influence in more direct ways -- even through the projection of military power.

**causes global war**

**Weitz, 11** - senior fellow at the Hudson Institute and a World Politics Review senior editor (Richard, “Can We Manage a Declining Russia?” November, http://www.aei.org/files/2011/12/08/-can-we-manage-a-declining-russia\_152701899417.pdf)

Conversely, a Russia relatively weaker to the United States would have less capability to challenge the United States but can provide less assistance for realizing common U.S.-Russian goals. A weaker Russia may also find it harder to control its WMD assets and become vulnerable to external predators not friendly to the United States (e. g.. China and Iran). But in all probability Russia will still have sufficiently strong nuclear forces to ward off external threats. Most worrisome, a Russian leadership that perceived Russia on a slope toward protracted decline might feel compelled to take **drastic measures**, internally and externally, to reverse its descent. The German Empire, Imperial Japan, and other great powers in the 20th century attempted to reverse their feared decline in ways that **helped precipitate disastrous global wars.**

### 2NC Relations Scenario

**U.S. gas production challenges Russian gas dominance over the EU**

**Daly, 12** Ph.D. from the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London. served as Director of Programs at the Middle East Institute in Washington DC before joining UPI as International Correspondent, “Russia Rattled by Rising Importance of Shale Gas,” <http://oilprice.com/Energy/Natural-Gas/Russia-Rattled-by-Rising-Importance-of-Shale-Gas.html>

Whilst it is exceedingly difficult to summon up much sympathy for either Russia’s state-owned natural gas monopoly Gazprom or Russian President-elect Vladimir Putin, the dynamic rise of natural gas produced by hydraulic fracturing, or ‘fracking,” has raised alarm bells in the highest reaches of the Kremlin. Why? Because Gazprom’s European customers, tired of being ripped off by Gazprom, are avidly exploring the possibilities of undertaking fracking to develop their own sources of the “blue gold,” and nowhere is interest higher than in the Russian Federation’s neighbors Ukraine, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria and China. The Russian leadership is sufficiently unnerved by the prospect that on 11 April Prime Minister Putin told the State Duma in his final address before he takes over as president on 7 May, "We have to be ready for any external shocks. The likelihood of them recurring is, as you know, high. The world has entered an era of turbulence, and there's also a new wave of technological changes. The configuration of the global markets is altering. There have been questions from the various political factions, and I'm just going respond to some of them. For example, the U.S. in recent years has been actively engaged in the production of shale gas. Colleagues from the Liberal Democratic Party asked about this problem. Do you realize how important this is - after the collapse of the Soviet Union, we inherited a whole series of intermediaries and transit networks. This could of course redefine the hydrocarbons market in a big way. Russian energy companies have to be ready right now to meet this challenge." Underlining the seriousness of the issue, Putin’s speech was broadcast live by the Russia 24 TV network. Seeking to put a positive spin on his grim pronouncements, Putin continued, "I fully agree with the proposals of the Duma deputies that we need to establish a system for better long-term forecasting in the macroeconomic, financial, technological and defense sectors. This is especially important because the 21st century promises to be a new era of new major geopolitical centers in the financial, political and cultural and spheres. The last four years have brought into our national treasury of oil and gas riches the Vankor and Talakan developments and new fields in Yamal, Yakutia and Sakhalin. Work has begun in the Caspian and on the Arctic shelf. Construction has begun on the first phase of the ‘Eastern Siberia - Pacific Ocean’ oil pipeline as we come to supply the Asia-Pacific region, a very efficient, fast-growing area of the world. On the world oil market, Russia has even created a new grade of oil. Furthermore, last year, for the first time we went directly to the gas market in Europe with the imminent opening of the ‘Nord Stream’ natural gas pipeline under the Baltic Sea and by the end of the year should begin laying the ‘South Stream’ pipeline.” What Putin signally failed to tell the Duma delegates was that the rapid growth in U.S. shale gas production has already led Gazprom to postpone the launch of its massive Shtokman gas condensate field development in the Barents Sea, which contains an estimated 3.9 trillion cubic meters (tcm) of natural gas. In 2009 the U.S. overtook Russia as the world’s biggest producer of natural gas as expanded fracking activity to extract fuel trapped in shale rocks. Even worse, by 2016 the U.S. plans to become a net exporter of liquefied natural gas, with initial sales of 31.1 million cubic meters (mcm) a day doubling within three years. Gazprom’s exports to Europe are already falling because of increased competition. Moscow’s National Research University Higher School of Economics Center for evaluation of commodity assets director Valery Kryukov noted that while Gazprom previously supplied 37 percent of Europe’s natural gas needs, that had slipped to 25 percent and concluded, “Russia risks losing its main source of income - the export of natural gas.”

**Breaks Europe’s dependence on Russia**

**Ratner et al, 12** Michael is a specialist in energy policy, Paul Belkin, analyst in European affairs, Jim Nichol, specialist in Russian and Eurasian affairs, and Steven Woehrel, specialist in European Affairs, “Europe’s Energy Security: Options and Challenges to Natural Gas Supply Diversification”, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R42405.pdf

¶ The 27 member-state European Union (EU) has been a growing natural gas consumer and importer for decades. However, as Europe’s natural gas production has declined in recent years, its dependence on imported natural gas has increased. This has left it more dependent as a whole on its primary supplier, Russia, which has shown some inclination to use its resources for political ends. Natural gas, unlike oil which is a global commodity, is a regional commodity with regional buyers and sellers exerting more influence. ¶ Over the past decade, some European officials have become increasingly concerned about the potential for cutoffs or curtailments of Russian natural gas supplies to Europe. Most Russian natural gas exports to Europe flow through Ukraine and Belarus. Fragile and sometimes hostile relations between Kyiv, Minsk, and Moscow have in the past resulted in interruptions in the flow of natural gas to parts of Europe, as happened in 2006 and 2009. Some countries in Eastern Europe, which are in some cases almost **exclusively reliant** on Russian gas imports, have been particularly susceptible to these fluctuations. ¶ Despite its growing dependence on Russian natural gas, Europe is well positioned geographically to benefit from recent changes in global natural gas development. Since the advent of shale gas in the United States, the world appears to be potentially awash in natural gas. A 2011 study commissioned by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) showed that technically recoverable shale gas resources worldwide may exceed current global natural gas reserves.1Other key developments and possible alternatives to Russian natural gas are outlined below: ¶ Taken as a whole, North Africa could pose a credible alternative to Russian natural gas supplies. The change of regimes in Libya, in particular, and in Egypt as a result of the wave of regional unrest known as the “Arab Spring,” poses a potential opportunity to increase natural gas production and exports from these countries. Both Libya and Egypt have large natural gas reserves, but production and exports have been hampered by domestic policies. Algeria, the largest exporter of natural gas in North Africa and the third largest supplier to Europe behind Russia and Norway, may also hold large volumes of shale gas yet to be developed in addition to their substantial conventional reserves. ¶ Central Asia may hold the greatest potential for new natural gas supplies for Europe, but currently those supplies would have to transit Russia to arrive in the European market. The delays in developing a southern corridor natural gas pipeline route to Europe have forced Central Asian countries to look east instead of west to bypass Russia and open new markets.2¶ Liquefied natural gas (LNG) imports pose an additional alternative to Russian natural gas. In 2010, LNG comprised almost 20% of the EU’s natural gas imports and over 15% of its consumption. The EU has LNG import capacity to meet its peak winter demand for natural gas, but during most of the year the facilities are underutilized. Nevertheless, some countries are considering building additional LNG import terminals to diversify their sources of natural gas. In addition to LNG import terminals, the EU could benefit from increased natural gas storage facilities in order to manage their import capacity during non-peak periods, as well as more pipeline interconnections to move natural gas where it is needed. EU officials have identified both improvements as priorities and they are being pursued, but not without some difficulty.¶ The prospect of significant U.S. LNG exports may pose an opportunity for the United States to play a bigger role in European energy security and global natural gas markets. 3 Most of the proposed U.S. LNG export projects are located on the Gulf coast or east coast of the United States, making shipments, at least initially, more likely to go to Europe than Asia. Additionally, the U.S. natural gas market is one of the only markets in the world where natural gas is not priced against oil, giving it a cost advantage in most of Europe. Should future U.S. LNG contracts not include an oil-indexed formula, pressure would be added for other countries, including Russia, to follow suit. Russian companies, including state-controlled natural gas giant Gazprom, have adamantly defended oil-indexed natural gas prices.¶

**Willful disregard for core Russian interests turns Russia into a hostile challenger of the US – wrecks relations**

**Allison and Blackwill, 11** Graham, director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School and Robert is a senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, “Russia and U.S. National Interests Why Should Americans Care?”, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Russia-and-US-NI\_final-web.pdf

¶ Americans often tend to focus on either Russia’s strengths or its weaknesses without seeking an integrated understanding of the real Russia. This is problematic, because it leads to dangerous assumptions about Russia’s motives and conduct. For example, those who focus on Moscow’s strengths frequently see an assertive and dangerous rival without recognizing Russia’s profound insecurity. Conversely, those who concentrate on Russia’s shortcomings see a defeated power ill-prepared to resist American pressure or preferences. While these descriptions are clearly caricatures, views like those described above can produce damaging misjudgments. ¶ Russia is grappling with the contradictions between imperial nostalgia, on the one hand, and the dramatic decline in its power after the Soviet collapse, on the other. The Russian government’s failure to present a credible plan to reverse Russia’s decline or to develop a successful foreign policy strategy that strengthens the country’s international role makes this only more difficult and contributes to a sense of insecurity. Nevertheless, the United States has the opportunity to manage its relations with an evolving Russia in a manner that advances America’s vital national interests. The stakes are high. Russia is more than sufficiently powerful to create a host of costly—and even devastating—problems for the United States if Russian leaders believe that Washington has a hostile, or casual, disregard for Russian national interests and priorities. This is true even though most in Russia’s elite recognize that today’s Russia is not sufficiently strong to challenge American global leadership without the support of other major powers.

\*\*Also in lashout\*\*

**This causes war and will escalate globally**

**Weitz, 11** - senior fellow at the Hudson Institute and a World Politics Review senior editor (Richard, “Can We Manage a Declining Russia?” November, http://www.aei.org/files/2011/12/08/-can-we-manage-a-declining-russia\_152701899417.pdf)

Conversely, a Russia relatively weaker to the United States would have less capability to challenge the United States but can provide less assistance for realizing common U.S.-Russian goals. A weaker Russia may also find it harder to control its WMD assets and become vulnerable to external predators not friendly to the United States (e. g.. China and Iran). But in all probability Russia will still have sufficiently strong nuclear forces to ward off external threats. Most worrisome, a Russian leadership that perceived Russia on a slope toward protracted decline might feel compelled to take **drastic measures**, internally and externally, to reverse its descent. The German Empire, Imperial Japan, and other great powers in the 20th century attempted to reverse their feared decline in ways that **helped precipitate disastrous global wars.**

**Causes extinction without cooperation with Russia**

**Allison and Blackwill, 11,** Graham, director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School and Robert is a senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, “10 reasons why Russia still matters,”, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1011/67178.html

¶ That central point is that Russia matters a great deal to a U.S. government seeking to defend and advance its national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s decision to return next year as president makes it all the more critical for Washington to manage its relationship with Russia through coherent, realistic policies.¶ No one denies that Russia is a dangerous, difficult, often disappointing state to do business with. We should not overlook its many human rights and legal failures. Nonetheless, Russia is a player whose choices affect our vital interests in nuclear security and energy. It is key to supplying 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan and preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons.¶ Ten realities require U.S. policymakers to advance our nation’s interests by engaging and working with Moscow.¶ First, Russia remains the only nation that can erase the United States from the map in 30 minutes. As every president since John F. Kennedy has recognized, Russia’s cooperation is critical to **averting nuclear war**.¶ Second, Russia is our most consequential partner in preventing nuclear terrorism. Through a combination of more than $11 billion in U.S. aid, provided through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and impressive Russian professionalism, two decades after the collapse of the “evil empire,” not one nuclear weapon has been found loose.¶ Third, Russia plays an essential role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile-delivery systems. As Washington seeks to stop Iran’s drive toward nuclear weapons, Russian choices to sell or withhold sensitive technologies are the difference between failure and the possibility of success.¶ Fourth, Russian support in sharing intelligence and cooperating in operations remains essential to the U.S. war to destroy Al Qaeda and combat other transnational terrorist groups.¶ Fifth, Russia provides a vital supply line to 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan. As U.S. relations with Pakistan have deteriorated, the Russian lifeline has grown ever more important and now accounts for half all daily deliveries.¶ Sixth, Russia is the world’s largest oil producer and second largest gas producer. Over the past decade, Russia has added more oil and gas exports to world energy markets than any other nation. Most major energy transport routes from Eurasia start in Russia or cross its nine time zones. As citizens of a country that imports two of every three of the 20 million barrels of oil that fuel U.S. cars daily, Americans feel Russia’s impact at our gas pumps.¶ Seventh, Moscow is an important player in today’s international system. It is no accident that Russia is one of the five veto-wielding, permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, as well as a member of the G-8 and G-20. A Moscow more closely aligned with U.S. goals would be significant in the balance of power to shape an environment in which China can emerge as a global power without overturning the existing order.¶ Eighth, Russia is the largest country on Earth by land area, abutting China on the East, Poland in the West and the United States across the Arctic. This territory provides transit corridors for supplies to global markets whose stability is vital to the U.S. economy.¶ Ninth, Russia’s brainpower is reflected in the fact that it has won more Nobel Prizes for science than all of Asia, places first in most math competitions and dominates the world chess masters list. The only way U.S. astronauts can now travel to and from the International Space Station is to hitch a ride on Russian rockets. The co-founder of the most advanced digital company in the world, Google, is Russian-born Sergei Brin.¶ Tenth, **Russia’s potential as a spoiler is difficult to exaggerate**. Consider what a Russian president intent on frustrating U.S. international objectives could do — from stopping the supply flow to Afghanistan to selling S-300 air defense missiles to Tehran to joining China in preventing U.N. Security Council resolutions.¶ So next time you hear a policymaker dismissing Russia with rhetoric about “who cares?” ask them to identify nations that matter more to U.S. success, or failure, in advancing our national interests.

## Naval Readiness DA

### 1NC

**Naval readiness high now – now is key to deter war**

Katz, 13, Douglas retired vice admiral, former commander of the Fifth Fleet, "A Strong Navy," The Hill, thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/economy-a-budget/275395-a-strong-navy

On the other hand, even with the increasingly austere fiscal climate unfolding, the nation seems to be entering **a new naval era** that emphasizes the renewed importance of U.S. sea power. Add to that the ever turbulent Middle East and Southeast Asian regions demanding rapid response capabilities, **it is now more imperative than ever** that civilian decision makers wisely plan for an adequate future size and composition of the our Fleet. In times of conflict, our Navy is called upon to control the seas, deny their use to the enemy, and to protect and sustain power ashore, indispensible in successful military operations. A strong Navy is a recognized United States commitment to the world. Our Navy is unique among all others in that the Fleet is not garrisoned in U.S. home ports but is spread across the globe. In fact, we presently have approximately 110 of those 287 ships deployed at any one time **with every expectation** that **that number will rise** as our naval commitments increase. Such recognized presence is a key element of the U.S. global defense posture. That presence is there to cooperate and defend partners and allies. It signals our national intent, prevents and **deters aggression**, promotes regional security and responds quickly to crises, to include humanitarian, no matter where they flare up.

#### Plan wrecks naval readiness – squo isn’t sufficient to trigger it

Weiss, 12, Daniel Center for American Progress Action Fund senior fellow

"The American Energy Initiative," Congressional Documents and Publications,

There have been recent proposals to open areas off the Atlantic coast for oil and gas production. Such proposals, however, could impair national security because a large portion part of this area is criticalfor a wide array of military training, including explosives, submarine exercises and Navy SEAL training. The Department of Defense wants to prohibit offshore drilling in a vast majority of the 2.9 million acre zone under consideration for oil production off Virginia. n65 About 20 percent, or 630,000 acres, would be open to drilling. n66 Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar reiterated that Defense Department needs will take precedence over the energy industry. n67 Similarly, proposals to open the Gulf coast of Florida to expanded oil and gas production would also interfere **with D**epartment **o**f **D**efense **training**. Tom Neubauer, president of the Bay Defense Alliance, raised concerns about conflict with the Navy during an April 2012 public hearing on the expansion of drilling. He warned: The Gulf test range, which is essentially everything east of the military mission line, which comes down from Pensacola into the Gulf of Mexico, is really essential to nine bases in Northwest Florida. Most of those bases do testing and training, research and development in the Gulf of Mexico. ... Drilling in those areas would impair those missions. n68 One of the benefits of energy independence would be enhanced national security. It makes little sense to strive for that goal by drilling in places that would interfere with our security. Drilling in these two places important to our military is even less sensible because "about 70 percent of undiscovered oil and gas resources are on federal lands that are available for leasing under current laws and administrative policies" according to recent analysis by the Congressional Budget Office. n69

#### Solves great power war

Roughead, 07, Gary Admiral, US Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, "A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower," Oct 2007, www.navy.mil/maritime/Maritimestrategy.pdf

This strategy reaffirms the use of seapower to influence actions and activities at sea and ashore. The expeditionary character and versatility of maritime forces provide the U.S. the **asymmetric advantage** of enlarging or contracting its military footprint in areas where access is denied or limited. Permanent or prolonged basing of our military forces overseas often has unintended economic, social or political repercussions. The sea is a vast maneuver space, where the presence of maritime forces can be adjusted as conditions dictate to enable **flexible approaches** to escalation, **de-escalation** **and deterrence of conflicts**. The speed, flexibility, agility and scalability of maritime forces provide joint or combined force commanders a range of options for responding to crises. Additionally, integrated maritime operations, either within formal alliance structures (such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization) or more informal arrangements (such as the Global Maritime Partnership initiative), send powerful messages to would-be aggressors that we will act with others to ensure collective security and prosperity. United States seapower will be globally postured to secure our homeland and citizens from direct attack and to advance our interests around the world. As our security and prosperity are inextricably linked with those of others, U.S. maritime forces will be deployed to protect and sustain the peaceful global system comprised of interdependent networks of trade, finance, information, law, people and governance. We will employ the global reach, persistent presence, and operational flexibility inherent in U.S. seapower to accomplish six key tasks, or strategic imperatives. Where tensions are high or where we wish to demonstrate to our friends and allies our commitment to security and stability, U.S. maritime forces will be characterized by regionally concentrated, forward-deployed task forces with the combat power to limit regional conflict, deter major power war, and should deterrence fail, win our Nation’s wars as part of a joint or combined campaign. In addition, persistent, mission-tailored maritime forces will be globally distributed in order to contribute to homeland defense-in-depth, foster and sustain cooperative relationships with an expanding set of international partners, and prevent or mitigate disruptions and crises. Credible combat power will be continuously postured in the Western Pacific and the Arabian Gulf/Indian Ocean to protect our vital interests, assure our friends and allies of our continuing commitment to regional security, and deter and dissuade potential adversaries and peer competitors. This combat power can be selectively and **rapidly repositioned to meet contingencies** that may arise elsewhere. These forces will be sized and postured to fulfill the following strategic imperatives: Limit regional conflict with forward deployed, decisive maritime power. Today regional conflict has ramifications far beyond the area of conflict. Humanitarian crises, violence spreading across borders, pandemics, and the interruption of vital resources are all possible when regional crises erupt. While this strategy advocates a wide dispersal of networked maritime forces, we cannot be everywhere, and we cannot act to mitigate all regional conflict. Where conflict threatens the global system and our national interests, maritime forces will be ready to respond alongside other elements of national and multi-national power, to give political leaders a range of options for deterrence, escalation and de-escalation. Maritime forces that are persistently present and combat-ready provide the Nation’s primary forcible entry option in an era of declining access, even as they provide the means for this Nation to respond quickly to other crises. Whether over the horizon or powerfully arrayed in plain sight, maritime forces can deter the ambitions of regional aggressors, assure friends and allies, gain and maintain access, and protect our citizens while working to sustain the global order. **Critical to this** notion **is the maintenance of a powerful fleet**—ships, aircraft, Marine forces, and shore-based fleet activities—capable of selectively controlling the seas, projecting power ashore, and protecting friendly forces and civilian populations from attack. Deter major power war. No other disruption is as potentially disastrous to global stability as war among major powers. Maintenance and extension of this Nation’s comparative seapower advantage is a **key component** of **deterring** major power war. While war with another great power strikes many as improbable, the near-certainty of its ruinous effects demands that it be actively deterred using all elements of national power. The expeditionary character of maritime forces—our lethality, global reach, speed, endurance, ability to overcome barriers to access, and operational agility—provide the joint commander with a range of deterrent options. We will pursue an approach to deterrence that includes a credible and scalable ability to retaliate against aggressors conventionally, unconventionally, and with nuclear forces.

### Naval Power High

#### Naval power high now but things can change quickly

Schofield, 12, Matthew, McClatchy Newspaper, “To tally the Navy’s strength requires more than math”, <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2012/10/23/172369/to-tally-the-navys-strength-requires.html>

America’s Navy is stronger, smaller, more dominant, more vulnerable and more lethal than at any time since World War I. So, for those confused by dueling candidates on the topic during Monday night’s presidential debate, hope that’s cleared up things. If not, it’s because determining naval strength, while never simple, is exceedingly complicated in these complicated times. All-of-the-above answers can be easily found among those who study the U.S. Navy. Sometimes, a single expert will voice many of the contradictions in the same statement. For what they’re worth, the raw numbers: The U.S. Navy today has 286 ships. In 1916 it had 245, and by 1917, 342. By the end of World War II, it had 6,768 ships. At the height of the Cold War in 1987, the Navy boasted 594 ships. The recent low point came in 2007 when it had 278 ships. For what it’s worth, in 1886, the Navy had only 38 ships, the most common of which were “screw sloops.” The modern Navy doesn’t list any screw sloops. But when looking at the numbers, Jacob Stokes, a researcher at the Center for a New American Security, notes that it’s important to remember that when the U.S. force reached its peaks, there was always a similarly armed foe: Germany, Japan, the Soviet Union. “Today, we don’t have a peer competitor,” he notes. U.S. naval superiority today is unquestioned. No other nation has more than two operational aircraft carriers. The United States has 11, and the other nations with two are Italy and Spain. China, the frequent foil in this discussion, just launched its first carrier but does not yet have planes capable of landing on it, and it does not yet have a single “carrier battle group.” “China won’t be showing up on the California coast anytime soon,” Stokes said. Max Boot advises Romney on defense issues, though his position is more nuanced than probably suits a presidential candidate during a debate. When asked to gauge the strength of the U.S. Navy, Boot noted that it “is incomparably stronger today than it was in 1916. But today’s Navy doesn’t have to fight the Navy of 1916.” He notes **potential enemies, China and Iran, and pirates**. The threats he notes include terrorism, missiles and cyber-weapons (none necessarily specific to naval power). “No question, the quality of our ships today is the highest it’s ever been, but at some point quality can’t substitute for a lack of quantity, and that’s the situation we’re in today,” he argues. The threat today’s Navy faces is multifaceted. But it can also rely upon a multifaceted network for response, from air support, missiles, unmanned drones and satellite intelligence. James R. Holmes, an associate professor of strategy at the U.S. Naval War College, though speaking on his own, notes: “We judge naval combat power on a relative scale. . . . That’s why ‘the Navy is smaller than it has been since 1917’ and ‘the Navy is bigger than the next 13 navies combined’ both contain a grain of truth but are basically factoids. Numbers count; the tonnage of ships counts; but these one-liners tell us little.” The reality of the modern world is that the U.S. Navy is very unlikely to be engaged in a traditional high-seas battle. Instead, potential battles would be close to land, meaning that naval power (on both sides) would have to include air power, ground power and missile capacity. Iran cannot match American naval power, but it can pose a potential threat if near a coast it uses smaller boats to “swarm” more powerful but less numerous U.S. ships. “You also have to be careful about just counting hulls,” Holmes notes. “A nuclear-powered aircraft carrier counts as one hull; so does a minesweeper.” Michael O’Hanlon, an expert on security with Washington’s Brookings Institution, said that while it is obvious there is no comparable naval threat, it’s important to remember the world can change, quickly. Japan hid an attacking force behind a thunderstorm to launch its attack on Pearl Harbor. Today, the Navy would rely on satellite intelligence for early warning. “But one consideration is that a foe in the future might have the ability to put satellites out of commission,” he said. “**It’s possible that this 20-year period will be viewed as a vacation from history.”**

### A2: No Ships

**Ship count not key to naval power – relative size matters**

Crisher and Souva, 12, Brian, PhD candidate in the Department of Political Science at Florida State University, and Mark Associate Professor Department of Political Science Florida State University, <http://themonkeycage.org/blog/2012/10/23/how-strong-is-the-u-s-navy-really/>

The US Navy has decreased in absolute size as Governor Romney argues (although this decline has been ongoing since the end of Cold War). U.S. warships are more powerful now than in the past, as President Obama implied. However, neither the number of warships nor the power of our ships is what is most important for understanding military and political influence. It is relative military power that matters most. In this respect, the U.S. navy is far stronger now than in 1916.

### A2: Budget Cuts

#### No impact to budget cuts – Navy agrees

**Axe, 13,** David Axe, “Navy Plans to Build Fewer Ships, Right as It’s About to Get Busier,” The Wired, 02.04.13 4:15 PMPg. http://tinyurl.com/axd2783

The U.S. Navy has finally and officially given up on long-standing plans to expand the fleet from today’s 285 major warships to 313 sometime in the next couple decades. Instead, the expansion will halt at 306 large ships, according to the latest [Navy planning document](http://blogs.defensenews.com/saxotech-access/pdfs/usn-force-structure-13013.pdf), obtained by Defense News. Officially, the lower goal is a result of careful analysis of U.S. strategy, the needs of regional commanders, ship service-life and the capabilities of the shipbuilding industry. (Navy officials [anticipated the shrinkage](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2012/03/congress-navy/) last year.) “A 306-ship combatant force [is] the current requirement to enable [the] Navy to deter and respond to crises and war,” the sailing branch asserted. As the Navy sees it, it can do that by buying fewer surface warfare ships and more logistics vessels, as well as by pre-positioning warships in allied ports. Unofficially, there is another huge factor: money. For all the talk inside the Pentagon about strategy driving budgets and not the other way around, the Navy is anticipating shrinkage right as it also anticipates playing a larger role in U.S. national security. The seven-ship reduction is a “reflection of budget realities,” Eric Wertheim, author of the definitive [Combat Fleets of the World](http://www.amazon.com/Naval-Institute-Guide-Combat-Fleets/dp/159114955X), tells Danger Room. Pentagon budgets have been steadily flattening for two years. And automatic spending cuts, [known as sequestration](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2013/01/defense-cash-chaos/) and mandated by the 2011 Budget Control Act, could slice another 10 percent off the military’s top-line starting in March — assuming the White House and lawmakers don’t reach a deficit-reduction agreement to avert sequestration.

### A2: No Shipbuilding

#### Shipbuliders are fine now

SF Chronicle, 13**,** “Global Military Shipbuilding and Submarines Industry Market Research Report from IBISWorld has Been Updated,” Published 9:00 am, Friday, February 8, 2013 <http://www.sfgate.com/business/prweb/article/Global-Military-Shipbuilding-and-Submarines-4262420.php#ixzz2Kb40wAn7>

Despite the massive effect of the global recession on builders of commercial aircraft and ships, companies primarily involved in the building of their military equivalents fared considerably better. The national security considerations of governments and long-term planning undertaken for military expenditure have ensured that revenue for the [Global Military Shipbuilding and Submarines industry](http://www.ibisworld.com/industry/global/global-military-shipbuilding-submarines.html?partnerid=prweb) has been relatively stable. IBISWorld expects that industry revenue will increase at an annualized 1.2% in the five years through 2012 to reach $38.9 billion. “This growth is primarily attributed to the demand for military ships and boats to protect coastal waters and to expand and renew navy fleet sizes,” says IBISWorld industry analyst [Antonio Danova](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=business%2Fprweb&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Antonio+Danova%22). “The contributions to industry revenue are particularly strong from North America, Europe and North Asia.” Government military budget cuts are forecast to lead to slower revenue growth of 0.3% in 2012. Profit margins have been relatively stable over the past five years, stemming from the contractual and long-term nature of ship builds. Nonetheless, profit margins declined slightly in the aftermath of the global downturn. Customer countries burdened with high levels of government debt started cutting defense spending, which put pressure on industry margins. “The [Global Military Shipbuilding and Submarines industry](http://www.ibisworld.com/industry/global/global-military-shipbuilding-submarines.html?partnerid=prweb) was able to reclaim previous profitability levels through capacity cuts,” adds Danova. “Profit margins are expected to remain stable over the next five years due to the stability of military demand and naval spending.” The industry has a medium level of market share concentration; the primary reasons for this concentration are the relatively high barriers to entry and a few buyers dominating the market. For example, the dominant buyer, the [US Department of Defense](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=business%2Fprweb&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22US+Department+of+Defense%22), accounts for about half of worldwide naval product purchases. Other large markets include Europe, the Middle East and Asia. In addition, the costs associated with manufacturing military ships, boats and components are very high. Therefore, customers usually award contracts to existing players with proven experience, such as major companies [General Dynamics Corporation](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=business%2Fprweb&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22General+Dynamics+Corporation%22), [Huntington Ingalls Industries](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=business%2Fprweb&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Huntington+Ingalls+Industries%22), Direction des [Construction Navales and Thales Group](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=business%2Fprweb&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Construction+Navales+and+Thales+Group%22). Concentration is expected to remain at this level as significant research and development is required to develop new products and innovation in the defense area. Revenue is projected to continue growing in the five years through 2017. The increase in revenue will stem from stable growth in defense budgets, particularly in the United States, and a focus on advanced electronics and information systems capabilities. An increase in naval manufacturing in emerging countries is also anticipated. For more information, visit IBISWorld’s [Global Military Shipbuilding and Submarines industry](http://www.ibisworld.com/industry/global/global-military-shipbuilding-submarines.html?partnerid=prweb) report page.

#### Less ships doesn’t hurt the military

**Axe 13** (David Axe, “Navy Plans to Build Fewer Ships, Right as It’s About to Get Busier,” The Wired, 02.04.13 4:15 PMPg. http://tinyurl.com/axd2783)

The U.S. Navy has finally and officially given up on long-standing plans to expand the fleet from today’s 285 major warships to 313 sometime in the next couple decades. Instead, the expansion will halt at 306 large ships, according to the latest [Navy planning document](http://blogs.defensenews.com/saxotech-access/pdfs/usn-force-structure-13013.pdf), obtained by Defense News. Officially, the lower goal is a result of careful analysis of U.S. strategy, the needs of regional commanders, ship service-life and the capabilities of the shipbuilding industry. (Navy officials [anticipated the shrinkage](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2012/03/congress-navy/) last year.) “A 306-ship combatant force [is] the current requirement to enable [the] Navy to deter and respond to crises and war,” the sailing branch asserted. As the Navy sees it, it can do that by buying fewer surface warfare ships and more logistics vessels, as well as by pre-positioning warships in allied ports. Unofficially, there is another huge factor: money. For all the talk inside the Pentagon about strategy driving budgets and not the other way around, the Navy is anticipating shrinkage right as it also anticipates playing a larger role in U.S. national security. The seven-ship reduction is a “reflection of budget realities,” Eric Wertheim, author of the definitive [Combat Fleets of the World](http://www.amazon.com/Naval-Institute-Guide-Combat-Fleets/dp/159114955X), tells Danger Room. Pentagon budgets have been steadily flattening for two years. And automatic spending cuts, [known as sequestration](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2013/01/defense-cash-chaos/) and mandated by the 2011 Budget Control Act, could slice another 10 percent off the military’s top-line starting in March — assuming the White House and lawmakers don’t reach a deficit-reduction agreement to avert sequestration.

### 2NC Link

#### The plan wrecks vital training operations

Young, 12, Bill – US House of Representatives (R-FL), former chair of the appropriations and defense committees , "Representative Young Casts Another Vote to Protect Florida's Gulf Coast from Drilling," States News Service

"I rise today to express my **continued support** for the **restrictions** placed on oil and gas leasing in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico under the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006. I am pleased that H.R. 6082 continues this moratorium and recognizes an area not only critical to the protection of Florida's beautiful beaches and unique environment but to the training of our nation's sailors, Marines and pilots who conduct training exercises there on a regular basis. As you know, I have been working on the issue of drilling in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico since 1983, when the oil industry proposed drilling off the Gulf Coast of Florida. That year, I offered an amendment to a 1983 supplemental appropriations bill to create the first buffer zone to protect Florida's Gulf Coast from offshore oil drilling. Congress did not implement this buffer zone only to protect the economic or environmental interests of the State of Florida; rather we also recognized the potential conflict that exists between drilling and naval and aviation **military activities**. The importance of this area to our military training was affirmed in 2000, when the Department of Defense requested that no above-surface structures be built in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico, officially establishing the Military Mission Line within which no drilling can occur. This decision **proved timely when the Air Force and Army were forced to end training exercises in Vieques, Puerto Rico** **and had to find a new site to undertake** these **specialized training** activities. The Eastern Gulf of Mexico **was the only site available where this training could continue** because this naval and aviation training is incompatible with drilling platforms and drilling ships. Since the first amendment in 1983, I negotiated with my colleagues to include this moratorium in appropriations bills year after year, until a bipartisan compromise was reached in 2006 that balanced increased domestic energy production with the critical military activities conducted in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico. This carefully crafted agreement opened 8.3 million acres south of the Florida Panhandle to drilling, an area previously under a ban, while barring new oil and gas leases off Florida's coastline until June 30, 2022, and codifying the ban on drilling within the Military Mission Line. Prior to the enactment of the current moratorium, then Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld stated that "in those areas east of the Military Mission Line, drilling structures and associated development would be incompatible with military activities, such as missile flights, low-flying drone aircraft, weapons testing and training." By maintaining the drilling ban in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico, H.R. 6082 **continues to protect an area that holds the U.S. military's largest training and testing area**. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this measure that will responsibly increase our domestic oil production while maintaining the important protections against drilling in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico, in order to ensure that our military readiness and training capabilities are not compromised."

#### OCS oil expansion disrupts irreplaceable testing and training ranges – key to air power, mine warfare, and spectrum

Jackson, 12, Scott - Emerald Coast Magazine writer, "Is Offshore Drilling Affecting National Security?" Exploring Emerald Coast,atd.agranite.com/emerald-coast/living/national-security-affected-by-offshore-platforms/

Beyond the wondrous vista of the shimmering and pristine coastal waters of the Gulf of Mexico reside two of our nation’s most precious resources – the oil and gas reserves below and the airspace above. While the value of further oil and gas exploration to the nation’s security is commonly known, the value of the airspace is not. The traditional pillars of economic growth normally incorporate land, labor and capital. But in Northwest Florida, there is another pillar that is equally valuable – airspace. It allows not only the flow of commercial aviation for business and tourism but military training and testing. Supersonic dogfights, training missions and weapons testing are conducted by F-15 Eagle and F-22 Raptor fighter jets, as well as other military aircraft, in specified blocks of airspace. Such exercises occur at carefully scheduled times to allow pilots unfettered concentration to scream through the air and hone their combat skills in a deliriously swirling amalgamation of blue skies, white clouds and emerald waters. Without undue interference, their mindset is rechanneled to the challenge – kill or be killed. But the waters below this airspace are also coveted for their rich oil and gas reserves by a country seeking energy independence. Eglin Air Force Base’s Air Armament Center conducts test and evaluation missions of new weapons involving full-size target drone aircraft in the skies over the 130,000-square-mile test and training range in the eastern Gulf – an area larger than the state of New Mexico. Between Oct. 1, 2007, and Sept. 30, 2008, more than 3,400 test missions were flown in this airspace. **Any civilian encroachment** on this training area could reduce the military value of Eglin’s mission to test and evaluate new weapon systems. **It isn’t the type of testing that can be** efficiently **performed anywhere else** in the continental United States. “**The Eglin Water Test Range has more airspace available** for testing new and legacy weapons **than the combined airspace of all U.S. land ranges,**” said Bob Arnold, chief of Eglin’s Mission Enhancement Committee. “This is important due to the increasing safety footprint size of our new fighter aircraft conducting air-to-air missile tests and training missions. The increased speed of these aircraft, coupled with the added range of the missiles, requires larger ‘clear areas’ for target debris resulting from our testing.” This range provides training areas for military pilots sharpening their combat skills from Air Force runways at Eglin, Tyndall Air Force Base and Hurlburt Field. And the future addition of the new F-35 Lightning II, a state-of-the-art supersonic fighter scheduled to arrive at Eglin in 2010, will demand even more use of the airspace. The Naval Surface Warfare Center at Panama City also uses the Gulf waters for testing and evaluation in the areas of mine warfare, special warfare, diving and life support. The combined economic impact of these four installations is $8.9 billion for Okaloosa and Bay counties, according to the Florida Defense Fact Book published by the University of West Florida’s Haas Business Center. Oil and gas drilling operations in the waters of the range cannot co-exist with ongoing Air Force testing without coordination and a firm understanding between them. These behemoth rigs cost upwards of $1 billion and incorporate a logistics lifeline to the mainland. “Our concern over oil/gas activity is related to the possible damage to oil/gas platforms associated with permanent production activity,” Arnold said. Moreover, the additional boat and helicopter support activity would require safe passage, and the radio emissions from the oil and gas platforms could interfere with military missions. As part of Eglin’s test and evaluation mission, a fleet of 50 Vietnam-era QF-4 fighter jets are used as remotely piloted, full-sized target drones, along with smaller drones for missile training and evaluation by the 82nd Aerial Targets Group operating from Tyndall Air Force Base. “Above-surface oil/gas platforms are **incompatible** with our military operations in areas of the Gulf of Mexico where we shoot down things like unmanned drone aircraft,” Arnold said. “Debris from these types of operations pose a serious safety hazard for the platforms and personnel who operate them, so obviously, this is not a situation we can allow to occur.” According to Arnold, the downing of a 25-ton QF-4 can produce tens of thousands of pieces of debris, with the wreckage hitting the water with the force of a minivan collision at 45 mph.

**OCS takes away valuable sea lanes – wrecks naval readiness – and independently destroys sub ops**

Weinstein, 10, Adam Mother Jones' national security reporter "DOD: We Hate Offshore Drilling, Too," Mother Jones, www.motherjones.com/mojo/2010/05/military-we-hate-offshore-drilling-too-navy-norfolk-bp-virginia

How about if it's discovered that outer continental shelf drilling is also anti-national-security? That's exactly what the Department of Defense appears to have done in a leaked portion of its new report (PDF), appropriately titled "Outer Continental Shelf (OCS): Military Activities and Future Oil & Gas Development." You see, the new conservative Virginia governor and shadow commander in chief, Bob McDonnell, longs to penetrate Virginia's sea plain with hard probes for profit. His plan was to make 4,500 square miles of ocean available to oil drillers by 2010. But! According to the Washington Post: The Defense Department report, concluded in March but released in part Tuesday by Rep. James P. Moran Jr. (D-Va.), a drilling opponent, indicates that drilling would interfere with military activities...in 72 percent of the 3 million acres covered by the lease sale and that it could be allowed only with restrictions in 6 percent of the area. As a former sailor who's operated out of Norfolk, Virginia—the world's largest naval installation—I can attest that its **sea lanes are** rather **critical to effective military activities**. Ships need to **move** through **quickly** and safely when deploying, and that process gets harder when additional surface contacts and navigational hazards are thrown into the brew. (Submarines, **which** also **operate extensively in the area,** face a special three-dimensional, **life-or-death challenge** with undersea drilling infrastructures.) Fleet training exercises, tactical readiness exams, sea trials of new ships, and many other classified but important endeavors begin off the Tidewater coast.

**Sub effectiveness key to naval readiness**

Padgett, 11, John Rear Admiral, "Projecting power," Armed Forced Journal, Sept 2011, www.armedforcesjournal.com/2011/09/7558135

One thing SSK and SSN advocates can agree on is the need for submarines. That need is growing and stems from the proliferation of threats to nonstealthy surface ships and aircraft — the mainstays of Navy power projection. Those platforms, along with forward bases, are becoming increasingly vulnerable to precision-guided weapons ranging from man-portable missiles and guided mortars to the most sophisticated surface-to-air missiles and anti-ship ballistic-missile threats. The submarine’s immunity to these threats and the nonprovocative nature of its presence provides commanders with much-needed intelligence preparation of the battle space, as well as strike, anti-submarine warfare, anti-surface warfare, special operations support and other missions.

#### Independently destroys carrier effectiveness

Helderman 10

Rosalind S. Helderman, Washington Post Staff Writer, May 19, 2010

Oil drilling off Va.'s shore would interfere with military, defense study says A newly released U.S. Defense Department report shows that exploratory drilling for oil and natural gas off almost three-quarters of the Virginia shoreline where the government has proposed those activities is incompatible with military operations and training. The report is the latest potential setback to a plan strongly endorsed by Gov. Robert F. McDonnell (R) to conclude sales of leases to companies interested in drilling 50 miles off Virginia's coast by 2012. The Defense Department report, concluded in March but released in part Tuesday by Rep. James P. Moran Jr. (D-Va.), a drilling opponent, indicates that drilling would interfere with military activities, including ordnance training and carrier operations, in 72 percent of the 3 million acres covered by the lease sale and that it could be allowed only with restrictions in 6 percent of the area. Norfolk is home to the world's largest naval base.

#### Key to naval readiness

**Eaglen, 08,** Mackenzie Senior Policy Analyst for National Security at The Heritage Foundation, “Aircraft Carriers Are Crucial,” July 31, Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/07/30/AR2008073003078.html

For any U.S. president, the aircraft carrier embodies the ultimate crisis management tool. Continuously deployed throughout the globe, carrier-strike groups give our military unparalleled freedom of action to respond to a range of combat and non-combat missions. The recent George Washington incident only further emphasizes the significance of maintaining a robust carrier fleet, one large enough to meet all contingencies and "surge" in crises, no matter what may happen. Carriers can move large contingents of forces and their support to distant theaters, respond rapidly to changing tactical situations, support several missions simultaneously, and, perhaps most importantly, guarantee access to any region in the world. In a time when America's political relationships with other countries can shift almost overnight, aircraft carriers can reduce America's reliance on others -- often including suspect regimes -- for basing rights. A carrier's air wing can typically support 125 sorties a day at a distance up to 750 nautical miles. They also operate as a hub in the strike group's command, control, communications and intelligence network, playing an increasingly larger role in controlling the battlespace at sea. Whether in a direct or support role, carriers have taken part in almost every major military operation the U.S. has undertaken since the Second World War. They also serve as first-rate diplomatic tools to either heighten or ease political pressure. When tensions with North Korea or Iran increase, a carrier, or sometimes two, is sent to patrol off their coast. And when an election takes place in a nascent democracy or country central to U.S. interests, a strike group typically is sailing offshore. In March, when Taiwan held important presidential elections that will chart the future of that country's relationship with China, both the Kitty Hawk and Nimitz trolled nearby to ensure a smooth transition of events and deliver a psychological message of U.S. interest.

### A2: Navy Defense

#### Naval forces solves war

Vego, 08, Milan N., Professor of Operations in the Joint Military Operations Department at the Naval War College, “On Naval Power,” JFQ Issue 50, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA517358

Naval forces can be employed in support of foreign policy, military (theater) strategy, and peace operations. Navies are an ideal tool for providing support of foreign policy. Their main advantages are flexibility, mobility, and political symbolism. Naval forces have diverse capabilities that can be quickly tailored to the situation at hand. They are also largely self-sufficient and do not require extensive land support. Naval¶ forces can be employed in support of the country’s diplomatic initiatives in peacetime and time of crisis, or for naval diplomacy— actions aimed to create a favorable general and military image abroad, establish one’s rights in areas of interest, reassure allies¶ and other friendly countries, influence the behavior of other governments, threaten seaborne interdiction, and, finally, threaten the use of lethal force. Deployment of naval forces during times of tension or crisis to back up diplomacy and thereby pose an unstated but clear threat is an example of naval diplomacy, which can also help in coalition-building.¶ Navies are generally much more effective than armies or air forces in terms of their international acceptability and capacity to make the desired impact. They can be used symbolically to send a message to a specific government. When a stronger message is required, naval diplomacy can take the form of employment of carefully tailored forces with a credible offensive capability, signaling that a much more capable force will follow,¶ or it can give encouragement to a friendly country by providing reinforcement. The threat of the use of limited offensive action or coercion might be designed to deter a possible aggressor or to compel him to comply with a diplomatic demarche or resolution.¶ Naval forces can be used in conflict prevention, coercive diplomacy, and peace operations. Conflict prevention includes diverse military activities conducted either unilaterally or collectively under Chapter¶ VI of the UN Charter and aimed at either preventing escalation of disputes into armed conflict or facilitating resolution of armed violence. These actions range from diplomatic initiatives to preventive deployment of naval forces. The main purpose of the forward presence of U.S. naval forces in the western Pacific, Arabian Sea, Persian (Arabian) Gulf, and Mediterranean is to prevent the outbreak of large-scale hostilities that might affect the national interests of the United States and¶ its allies or friends. Naval forces deployed¶ in forward areas should be of sufficient size and combat power to defeat opposing forces quickly and decisively.¶ Under the UN Charter, conflict prevention should be conducted with strict impartiality because all sides in a dispute have to agree to involve other countries as mediators. Naval forces can be deployed in the proximity of a country where hostilities threaten to break out. Aircraft carrier groups and amphibious task forces in particular have a greater chance of success in disputes among nation-states than in ethnic conflict or civil war. To be effective, such a deployment should be accompanied by a clear willingness on the part of the international community to use overwhelming force if necessary. Otherwise, the preventive deployment of naval forces, regardless of size and capability, will rarely produce the desired effect.¶ Naval forces are one of the most effective and flexible tools in applying coercive diplomacy (popularly called gunboat diplomacy), which is the use or threat of limited naval force aimed at securing advantage¶ or averting loss, either in furtherance of¶ an international dispute or against foreign nationals within the territory or jurisdiction of their own state. Coercive diplomacy¶ is conducted both in peacetime and during operations short of war. Methods used are “show the flag,” retaliatory raids, rescue operations, or direct attack to achieve a specific military objective. Visits of warships to foreign ports are one of the most common methods of showing the flag. The aim of such visits can range from demonstrating continuing interest in the area to showing resolve¶ in support of a friendly state against threats by a neighboring state. The ships then act as ambassadors. Normally, the main purpose of such visits is to make a favorable impression on the local populace. The degree to which a show of force can be introduced depends on the political message to be communicated. Sometimes it can be carried out as a warning to leaders or hostile states. At other times,¶ a show of force by ships can act as a sign of reassurance and a token of support.

**A strong navy solves extinction**

**Johnson and Krulak 97**, Jay Chief of Naval Operations and Charles is the Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, “Forward Presence is Essential to American Interests”, <http://www.milnet.com/pentagon/navy/fwdpresn.htm>

Also this morning, United States Navy amphibious assault ships carrying 4,400 combat-ready American Marines are forward deployed in the waters of the Mediterranean Sea and the Persian Gulf. And at sea in the Mediterranean and in the Persian Gulf are aircraft carrier battle groups with 16,000 Sailors and two air wings of combat ready aircraft. And finally, in the Far East, the United States has permanently deployed a third aircraft carrier battle group and a third amphibious ready group. The vigilant "forward presence" of these forces is vital, but not always as visible to Americans as it is to the rest of the world. Their routine daily efforts don't always make the headlines, but they are vitally important to world peace and stability. Some argue that the forward presence these forces represent is no longer necessary. They argue that forces reacting from the United States are enough to maintain international stability. They further maintain that "brushfires," or outbreaks of regional instability, are insignificant, or incidental at best. And they argue that America can no longer afford the forward presence of these forces on what amounts to a near continuous basis. We would argue just the opposite. Forward deployed U.S. forces, primarily naval expeditionary forces — the Navy-Marine Corps team — are vital to regional stability and to keeping these crises from escalating into full-scale wars. To those who argue that the United States can't afford to have this degree of vigilance anymore, we say: The United States can't afford not to. These brushfires, whether the result of long-standing ethnic tensions or resurgent nationalism in the wake of the Cold War will only continue. The Cold War was an anomaly. Never again will we live in a bipolar world whose nuclear shadow suppressed nationalism and ethnic tensions. We have, in some respects, reverted back to the world our ancestors knew: A world in disorder. Somalia, Bosnia, Liberia, Haiti, Rwanda, Iraq and the Taiwan Straits are merely examples of the types of continuing crises we now face. Some might call this period an age of chaos. The United States and the world cannot afford to allow any crisis to escalate into threats to the United States', and the world's, vital interests. And while the skies are not dark with smoke from these brushfires, today's world demands a new approach. The concepts of choice must be selective and committed engagement, unencumbered global operations and prompt crisis resolution. There is no better way to maintain and enforce these concepts than with the forward presence of the U.S. Navy-Marine Corps team. There are four basic tenets to international security in today's world; prevention, deterrence, crisis resolution and war termination. The underlying assumption of these tenets is that the U.S. and its allies should not be forced into winning a war in an overwhelming (and expensive) fashion. Instead, it is much better — and cheaper — to resolve a crisis before it burns out of control. \* Prevent: The key to prevention is continuous presence in a region. This lets our friends know we have an interest and lets potential foes know that we're there to check any move. Both effects occur without any direct action taken. Although hard to measure, the psychological impact of naval expeditionary forces is undeniable. This regional presence underwrites political and economic stability. This is forward presence. \* Deter: Presence does not prevent every crisis. Some rogues are going to be tempted to strike no matter what the odds, and will require active measures to be deterred. When crises reach this threshold, there is no substitute for sustained actual presence. Naval expeditionary forces can quickly take on the role of the very visible fist. Friends and potential enemies recognize naval expeditionary forces as capable of defending or destroying. This visible fist, free from diplomatic and territorial constraints, forms the bedrock of regional deterrence. For example, the mere presence of naval expeditionary forces deterred Chinese attempts to derail the democratic process in Taiwan and countered Iraqi saber-rattling toward Jordan. It's hard to quantify the cost savings of deterring a crisis before it requires our intervention. But the savings are real — in dollars, and often in blood and human misery. This is forward presence. \* Resolve: If a crisis can be neither prevented nor deterred, then prompt and decisive crisis resolution is imperative before the crisis threatens vital interests. U.S. Naval expeditionary forces are a transoceanic key that finds and opens — forcibly if necessary — any gateway into a fiery world. This ability is equally expandable and retractable according to the situation. Perhaps most importantly, naval expeditionary forces don't need permission from foreign governments to be on scene and take unilateral action in a crisis. This both unencumbers the force and takes the pressure off allies to host any outside forces. Over the past two years, for example, U.S. naval expeditionary forces simultaneously and unilaterally deployed to Liberia and to the Central African Republic (1,500 miles inland) to protect U.S. and international citizens. They also launched measured retaliatory Tomahawk strikes to constrain unacceptable Iraqi behavior, and conducted naval air and Tomahawk strikes which brought the warring parties in Bosnia to the negotiating table. This is forward presence. \* Terminate: Each of the above tenets is worthy of the United States paying an annual peace insurance premium. Otherwise we, and our allies, risk paying the emotional, physical and financial costs of a full-blown conflagration that began as just another brushfire. If there is a war, naval expeditionary forces will be first to fight. They are inherently capable of enabling the follow-on forces from the United States for as long as it takes. And they will remain on-scene to enforce the settlement that ends the conflict. This is forward presence. The Iraqis, Central Africas, Somalias and Bosnias inevitably destabilize and erode world order and respect for the rule of law. Indeed, a failure to respond to them encourages future — more serious — crises. The United States must foster stability around the world, today and tomorrow. The peace insurance premium is a small price and is the cost of leadership. Who else is capable of this type of forward presence on a global basis? For the United States, maintaining a steady commitment to stability will be a challenge. But maintain it we must, or the price, literally and figuratively, will be much greater down the road. The example of fighting forest fires is precisely applicable. The philosophy is simple: Prevention through living in the environment; deterrence through vigilance; and resolution through quick and selective engagement. Ninety-five percent of all forest fires are contained — the direct result of the watchful presence of the local initial attack crews who attack flashpoints. As for the other five percent, once the window of opportunity for decisive early action is missed, firefighters must be brought in from outside the region, and it is exponentially more expensive. Sometimes there are casualties — casualties that would not have been incurred had the fire been contained before it had the opportunity to flare. America's Navy-Marine Corps team is underway, ready and on-scene at trouble spots around the world. Forward presence makes it — and will keep it — the right force, tailor-made for these uncertain and sometimes fiery times.

#### Naval power prevents Asian wars-  specifically China

Hultin and Blair 6. (Jerry MacArthur Hultin, Undersecretary for the Navy, Dennis Blair, former President for the Institute of Defense Analysis and Admiral, US Navy, “Naval Power and Globalization,” September, 2006 http://www.poly.edu/president/\_doc/hultin%20naval%20power.pdf)

Even if the interaction of US and Chinese decisions in future avoids a global naval arms race centered in the Pacific, China will still have a capable regional navy. World events may put China and the United States on opposite sides of an issue or crisis, leading to a maritime confrontation. The most likely location for this scenario is Taiwan. Successful deterrence depends on the United States **having strong naval capability** on station or quickly deployable so that there is no incentive to China or other adversaries to initiate hostilities.   The second Pacific area in which the United States must maintain a deterrent capability based on naval power is around the Korean Peninsula. North Korea is a failing state, but so long as Kim Jong II and his successors maintain their position of power, they will need to be deterred from military aggression.   To maintain deterrence, American naval strategy in the Pacific must preserve its alliance base, its forward deployed posture and its ability to reinforce quickly to assert maritime superiority throughout any crisis situation.

### Turns Economy

#### Naval power is key to the economy and free trade

Eaglen, 11, Mackenzie Heritage Foundation Research Fellow for National Security Studies, Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies, May, 16, 2011, “Thinking about a Day without Sea Power: Implications for U.S. Defense Policy”, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/05/thinking-about-a-day-without-sea-power-implications-for-us-defense-policy, 2/16/13,)

If the United States slashed its Navy and ended its mission as a guarantor of the free flow of transoceanic goods and trade, globalized world trade would decrease substantially. As early as 1890, noted U.S. naval officer and historian Alfred Thayer Mahan described the world’s oceans as a “great highway…a wide common,” underscoring the long-running importance of the seas to trade.[12] Geographically organized trading blocs develop as the maritime highways suffer from insecurity and rising fuel prices. Asia prospers thanks to internal trade and Middle Eastern oil, Europe muddles along on the largesse of Russia and Iran, and the Western Hemisphere declines to a “new normal” with the exception of energy-independent Brazil. For America, Venezuelan oil grows in importance as other supplies decline. Mexico runs out of oil—as predicted—when it fails to take advantage of Western oil technology and investment. Nigerian output, which for five years had been secured through a partnership of the U.S. Navy and Nigerian maritime forces, is decimated by the bloody civil war of 2021. Canadian exports, which a decade earlier had been strong as a result of the oil shale industry, decline as a result of environmental concerns in Canada and elsewhere about the “fracking” (hydraulic fracturing) process used to free oil from shale. State and non-state actors increase the hazards to seaborne shipping, which are compounded by the necessity of traversing key chokepoints that are easily targeted by those who wish to restrict trade. These chokepoints include the Strait of Hormuz, which Iran could quickly close to trade if it wishes. More than half of the world’s oil is transported by sea. “From 1970 to 2006, the amount of goods transported via the oceans of the world…increased from 2.6 billion tons to 7.4 billion tons, an increase of over 284%.”[13] In 2010, “$40 billion dollars [sic] worth of oil passes through the world’s geographic ‘chokepoints’ on a daily basis…not to mention $3.2 trillion…annually in commerce that moves underwater on transoceanic cables.”[14] These quantities of goods simply cannot be moved by any other means. Thus, a reduction of sea trade reduces overall international trade. U.S. consumers face a greatly diminished selection of goods because domestic production largely disappeared in the decades before the global depression. As countries increasingly focus on regional rather than global trade, costs rise and Americans are forced to accept a much lower standard of living. Some domestic manufacturing improves, but at significant cost. In addition, shippers avoid U.S. ports due to the onerous container inspection regime implemented after investigators discover that the second dirty bomb was smuggled into the U.S. in a shipping container on an innocuous Panamanian-flagged freighter. As a result, American consumers bear higher shipping costs. The market also constrains the variety of goods available to the U.S. consumer and increases their cost. A Congressional Budget Office (CBO) report makes this abundantly clear. A one-week shutdown of the Los Angeles and Long Beach ports would lead to production losses of $65 million to $150 million (in 2006 dollars) per day. A three-year closure would cost $45 billion to $70 billion per year ($125 million to $200 million per day). Perhaps even more shocking, the simulation estimated that employment would shrink by approximately 1 million jobs.[15] These estimates demonstrate the effects of closing only the Los Angeles and Long Beach ports. On a national scale, such a shutdown would be catastrophic. The Government Accountability Office notes that: [O]ver 95 percent of U.S. international trade is transported by water[;] thus, the safety and economic security of the United States depends in large part on the secure use of the world’s seaports and waterways. A successful attack on a major seaport could potentially result in a dramatic slowdown in the international supply chain with impacts in the billions of dollars.[16] As of 2008, “U.S. ports move 99 percent of the nation’s overseas cargo, handle more than 2.5 billion tons of trade annually, and move $5.5 billion worth of goods in and out every day.” Further, “approximately 95 percent of U.S. military forces and supplies that are sent overseas, including those for Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom, pass through U.S. ports.”[17]

#### Naval power key to the global economy

**Conway, Roughead, and Allen, 07** \*General of U.S. Marine Corps and Commandant of the Marine Corps, \*\*Admiral of U.S. Navy and Chief of Naval Operations, \*\*\*Admiral of U.S. Coast Guard and Commandant of the Coast Guard (\*James Conway, \*\*Gary Roughead, \*\*\*Thad Allen, "A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower", Department of the Navy, United States Marine Corps, United States Coast Guard, http://www.navy.mil/maritime/MaritimeStrategy.pdf

The world economy is tightly interconnected. Over the past four decades, total sea borne trade has more than quadrupled: 90% of world trade and two-thirds of its petroleum are transported by sea. The sea-lanes and supporting shore infrastructure are the lifelines of the modern global economy, visible and vulnerable symbols of the modern distribution system that relies on free transit through increasingly urbanized littoral regions. Expansion of the global system has increased the prosperity of many nations. Yet their continued growth may create increasing competition for resources and capital with other economic powers, transnational corporations and international organizations. Heightened popular expectations and increased competition for resources, coupled with scarcity, may encourage nations to exert wider claims of sovereignty over greater expanses of ocean, waterways, and natural resources—potentially resulting in conflict.

### Turns Heg

#### Heg is impossible without a strong navy

**Friedman, 07**, George Writer for Stratfor "The Limitations and Necessity of Naval Power", Stratfor- Global Intelligence Reports, April 10th 2007, http://www.stratfor.com/limitations\_and\_necessity\_naval\_power

The argument for slashing the Navy can be tempting. But consider the counterargument. First, and most important, we must consider the crises the United States has not experienced. The presence of the U.S. Navy has shaped the ambitions of primary and secondary powers. The threshold for challenging the Navy has been so high that few have even initiated serious challenges. Those that might be trying to do so, like the Chinese, understand that it requires a substantial diversion of resources. Therefore, the mere existence of U.S. naval power has been effective in averting crises that likely would have occurred otherwise. Reducing the power of the U.S. Navy, or fine-tuning it, would not only open the door to challenges but also eliminate a useful, if not essential, element in U.S. strategy — the ability to bring relatively rapid force to bear. There are times when the Navy’s use is tactical, and times when it is strategic. At this moment in U.S. history, the role of naval power is highly strategic. The domination of the world’s oceans represents the foundation stone of U.S. grand strategy. It allows the United States to take risks while minimizing consequences. It facilitates risk-taking. Above all, it eliminates the threat of sustained conventional attack against the homeland. U.S. grand strategy has worked so well that this risk appears to be a phantom. The dispersal of U.S. forces around the world attests to what naval power can achieve. It is illusory to believe that this situation cannot be reversed, but it is ultimately a generational threat. Just as U.S. maritime hegemony is measured in generations, the threat to that hegemony will emerge over generations. The apparent lack of utility of naval forces in secondary campaigns, like Iraq, masks the fundamentally indispensable role the Navy plays in U.S. national security.

### Turns Prolif

#### Resolves widespread prolif

**Conway, Roughead, and Allen, 07**- \*General of U.S. Marine Corps and Commandant of the Marine Corps, \*\*Admiral of U.S. Navy and Chief of Naval Operations, \*\*\*Admiral of U.S. Coast Guard and Commandant of the Coast Guard (\*James Conway, \*\*Gary Roughead, \*\*\*Thad Allen, "A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower", Department of the Navy, United States Marine Corps, United States Coast Guard, http://www.navy.mil/maritime/MaritimeStrategy.pdf,

Maritime forces will work with others to ensure an adequate level of security and awareness in the maritime domain. In doing so, transnational threats—terrorists and extremists; proliferators of weapons of mass destruction; pirates; traffickers in persons, drugs, and conventional weapons; and other criminals—will be constrained. By being there, forward deployed and engaged in mutually beneficial relationships with regional and global partners, maritime forces will promote frameworks that enhance security. When natural or manmade disasters strike, our maritime forces can provide humanitarian assistance and relief, joining with interagency and non-governmental partners. By participating routinely and predictably in cooperative activities, maritime forces will be postured to support other joint or combined forces to mitigate and localize disruptions.

### Turns Terror

#### Key to solve terrorism

**Conway, Roughead, and Allen, 07**- \*General of U.S. Marine Corps and Commandant of the Marine Corps, \*\*Admiral of U.S. Navy and Chief of Naval Operations, \*\*\*Admiral of U.S. Coast Guard and Commandant of the Coast Guard, \*James Conway, \*\*Gary Roughead, \*\*\*Thad Allen, "A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower", Department of the Navy, United States Marine Corps, United States Coast Guard, http://www.navy.mil/maritime/MaritimeStrategy.pdf,

Forward Presence. Maritime forces will be forward deployed, especially in an era of diverse threats to the homeland. Operating forward enables familiarity with the environment, as well as the personalities and behavior patterns of regional actors. Mindful of the sovereignty of other nations, this influence and understanding contributes to effective responses in the event of crisis. Should peacetime operations transition to war, maritime forces will have already developed the environmental and operational understanding and experience to quickly engage in combat operations. Forward presence also allows us to combat terrorism as far from our shores as possible. Where and when applicable, forward deployed maritime forces will isolate, capture, or destroy terrorists, their infrastructure, resources and sanctuaries, preferably in conjunction with coalition partners.

### Peacekeeping Impact

**A strong navy is critical to effective peacekeeping**

**Vego, 08,** Milan professor of operations at the Naval War College, former commanding officer in the former Yugoslav Navy and former West German merchant marine, “On Naval Power”, Joint Forces Quarterly, July 2008, http://www.ndu.edu/press/lib/pdf/jfq-50/JFQ-50.pdf

**Naval forces are most extensively used in support of peace operations**, which are military operations to support diplomatic efforts to reach a long-term political settlement. These actions are conducted in conjunction with diplomacy as necessary to negotiate a truce and resolve a conflict. They may be initiated in support of diplomatic activities before, during, or after the conflict. Peacekeeping and peace enforcement are the principal types of peace operations. Peacekeeping operations are designed to contain, moderate, or terminate hostilities between or within states, using international or impartial military forces and civilians to complement political conflict-resolution efforts and restore and maintain peace. These actions take place after the sides in a conflict agree to cease hostilities; impartial observers are normally sent to verify the implementation of the ceasefire or to monitor the separation of forces. Peace-enforcement operations involve diverse tasks as authorized by Chapter VII of the UN Charter. The objective is to compel compliance with resolutions or sanctions that have been adopted to maintain or restore peace or order. The tasks of peace enforcement include implementation of sanctions, establishment and supervision of exclusion zones, intervention to restore order, and forcible separation of belligerents. The aim is to establish an environment for a truce or ceasefire. In contrast to peacekeeping operations, peace-enforcement operations do not require the consent of the warring factions involved in a conflict. When used for peace enforcement, naval forces should have at least limited power projection capabilities and be ready to engage in combat. Naval forces may also be involved in expanded peacekeeping and peaceenforcement operations. These operations are larger than peacekeeping operations and can involve over 20,000 personnel. The consent of the sides in the conflict is usually nominal, incomplete, or nonexistent. These operations include more assertive mandates and rules of engagement, including the use of force under Chapter VIII of the UN Charter. 8 Expanded peacekeeping/peace-enforcement operations are conducted with strictly limited objectives, such as protecting safe-flight or no-fly zones or relief deliveries. If too intrusive, the operations are likely to draw multinational forces into open hostilities; the naval forces would then have to be either pulled out or committed to full-scale combat. 9

**Peacekeeping prevents great power wars**

**Dean, 95,** Jonathan Adviser on international security issues for the Union of Concerned Scientists, “A stronger U.N. strengthens America,” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. Chicago: Mar 1995. Vol. 51, Iss. 2; pg. 45Ebscohost

Experts throughout the world expect growing population pressures and increasing environmental stress to develop over the coming decades into intense, far-reaching social unrest and regional conflict. Economic development is the solution, however slow and uncertain it may be in coming. But the world also needs effective regional conflict-prevention procedures. Left on its own, regional violence can lead to confrontation and even war between the great powers, including the United States, as might occur, for example, in the event of conflict between Ukraine and Russia or between China and its neighbors. In the final analysis, unchecked regional violence and the fear of further violence will lead more states to develop nuclear weapons. In past decades, this process occupied in Israel, South Africa, India, Pakistan, Iraq, and presumably, in North Korea. A world with 20 or 80 nuclear weapon states would not only make a more effective global security system impossible, it would lead the present nuclear weapon states to modernize and increase their weapons—and it would markedly increase the vulnerability of the United States to direct attack. Instead of shrugging at human fallibility, accepting war as inevitable, and reacting after it happen, U.S. policy should aim at establishing an international peacekeeping system that can head off an increasing number of conflicts.

## Politics Links

**Drilling is unpopular – seen as flip-flopping**

**Quelly, 14**, John staff writer, “New Offshore Drilling Leases Seen as Betrayal of Obama Climate Pledge”, https://www.commondreams.org/headline/2014/06/13-7

An [announcement](http://www.interior.gov/news/pressreleases/five-year-leasing-plan.cfm) by two federal agencies on Friday that opens the door to new offshore driling for oil and gas in the nation's coastal waters is receiving criticism as an example of the exactly wrong course of action at a time when serious efforts must be made to transition away from fossil fuels in the face of climate change.¶ Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell and Acting Director of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) Walter Cruickshank made a joint announcement as they opened a forty-five day period for industry and public comment on schedule of new lease sales for drilling in federal waters that would take place between 2017-2022.¶ The new five-year leasing schedule will replace the current schedule of drilling operations that are set to expire in August of 2017. The current leases, according to the BOEM, currently include about 6,200 active OCS leases, covering more than 33 million acres – the vast majority in the Gulf of Mexico. Of those, 1,064 are producing leases, covering 5.2 million producing acres – the highest acreage under production since 2008.¶ As *The Hill* [reports](http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/209311-interior-takes-step-toward-new-oil-and-gas-leases):¶ The [new] request, published in Friday's Federal Register, officially opens the books to a wide range of options. Interior must consider sales in all 20 outer continental shelf planning areas.¶ Prominent oil lobby American Petroleum Institute (API) is pressing the department to consider areas that are otherwise off limits.¶ "The department should thoroughly analyze the entire resource-rich areas of interest," API policy adviser Andy Radford said on a call with reporters Friday.¶ Radford added that Interior should "draft an expansive leasing plan that maintains current leasing areas and seeks to unlock new areas that are currently off-limits."¶ But critics are raising serious objections to the new wave of potential leases and offshore drilling.¶ “It’s troubling to see the Obama administration pushing to expand offshore drilling, especially as his own scientists are sounding the alarm about global warming," said Miyoko Sakashita, an expert on ocean policy for the Center for Biological. "Fossil fuels are what have gotten us into this mess so it makes no sense to double-down on oil and gas development."¶ "Offshore drilling also comes with huge risks for our oceans, beaches and wildlife," Sakashita continued. "An oil spill in a place like the Arctic would be devastating for polar bears and walruses. Rather than trying to drill in more places along America’s shores, the Obama administration ought to halt any new offshore drilling leases and pursue safer, cleaner energy sources.”

**Plan sets off a fight about environmental damages**

**Horton, 13,** Jennifer Staff Writer, “Why is offshore drilling so controversial?”, http://science.howstuffworks.com/environmental/energy/offshore-drilling-controversy1.htm

Effects of Offshore Drilling: Energy vs. Environment¶ Any time [oil drilling](http://science.howstuffworks.com/environmental/energy/oil-drilling.htm) is mentioned, you know there's going to be talk of its environmental impacts. When it comes to [offshore oil drilling](http://science.howstuffworks.com/environmental/energy/offshore-drilling.htm), that talk is even more heated, since you're not just digging underground but also thousands of feet underwater.¶ Whenever oil is recovered from the ocean floor, other chemicals and toxic substances come up too -- things like mercury, lead and arsenic that are often released back into the ocean. In addition, seismic waves used to locate oil can harm sea mammals and disorient whales. ExxonMobil recently had to suspend exploration efforts near Madagascar after more than 100 whales beached themselves [source: [Nixon](http://www.livescience.com/environment/080625-oil-drilling.html)].¶ The infrastructure required to drill wells and transport offshore oil can be equally devastating. A series of canals built across [Louisiana](http://maps.howstuffworks.com/maps-of-louisiana.htm) wetlands to transport oil has led to erosion. Along with the destruction of the state's marshland caused by drilling efforts, the canals have removed an important storm buffer, possibly contributing to the damage caused by [Hurricane](http://science.howstuffworks.com/nature/natural-disasters/hurricane.htm) Katrina. The petrochemical plants built nearby add to the negative effects ¶

#### Plan drains capital

Hobson, 12,Margaret, Writer for E&E, the leading source for comprehensive, daily coverage of environmental and energy politics and policy., "Obama's development plans gain little political traction in years since Gulf spill", [www.eenews.net/public/energywire/2012/04/18/1](http://www.eenews.net/public/energywire/2012/04/18/1)

President Obama is embracing the offshore oil and gas development policies he proposed in early 2010 but were sidelined in the shadow of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. Two years after the BP PLC oil rig exploded, killing 11 people and causing the worst oil spill in U.S. history, Obama's "all of the above" energy policy includes offshore drilling provisions that are nearly identical to his aggressive March 2010 drilling plan. Since the moratorium on offshore oil drilling ended in late 2010, the administration expanded oil and gas development in the western and central Gulf of Mexico and announced plans for lease sales in the eastern Gulf. The White House appears poised to allow Royal Dutch Shell PLC to begin exploring for oil this summer in Alaska's Beaufort and Chukchi seas and to open oil industry access to the Cook Inlet, south of Anchorage. The administration is also paving the way for oil and gas seismic studies along the mid- and south Atlantic coasts, the first such survey in 30 years. While opening more offshore lands to oil and gas development, the Obama administration has also taken steps to make offshore oil drilling safer, according to a report card issued yesterday by Oil Spill Commission Action, an oversight panel formed by seven members of President Obama's oil spill commission. That report criticized Congress for failing to adopt new oil spill safety laws but praised the Interior Department and industry for making progress in improving offshore oil development safety, environmental protection and oil spill preparation. An environmental group was less complimentary. A report yesterday by Oceana charged that the measures adopted by government and industry are "woefully inadequate." As the 2012 presidential campaign heats up and gasoline prices remain stuck near $4 per gallon, Obama's offshore oil development policies aren't winning him any political capital. The environmental community hates the drilling proposals. The Republicans and oil industry officials complain that the White House hasn't gone far enough. And independent voters are confused by the president's rhetoric. According to the GOP political firm Resurgent Republic, independent voters in Colorado and Virginia don't understand what Obama's "all of the above" energy mantra means. The report said, however, that once the policy was "described as oil, gas, coal, nuclear power, solar and other alternative energies, participants became enthusiastic and view such a strategy as credible and necessary to becoming more energy independent." A recent Gallup poll indicated that American voters are polarized on energy issues. The survey found that 47 percent of the public believes energy development is more important than environmental protection, while 41 percent of the public ranks protecting the environment as a bigger priority. In that political climate, Obama's offshore oil development policies are not likely to affect the nation's most conservative or liberal voters, noted Larry Sabato, director of the University of Virginia's Center for Politics. "The environmentalists have no place to go except Obama, and Obama isn't going to convince any conservatives or Republicans to back him" based on his oil and gas proposals, Sabato said. "He's obviously aiming at swing independents," Sabato added. "He's trying to show that he's pursuing a middle path, the one many independents like. Maybe it will work." Back to the original plan, minus 2 pieces Obama's all-of-the-above energy policy is in keeping with his pre-oil-spill offshore oil and gas development proposal. After the Deepwater Horizon disaster, the White House slapped a six-month moratorium on all new oil and gas development. Since the moratorium ended, Obama has systematically reintroduced most of the early oil development proposals. Two pieces of the old plan are missing. Obama backtracked on his proposal to allow oil exploration off Virginia's coast. The new East Coast offshore plan lays the groundwork for seismic studies, but not drilling, along the mid- and south Atlantic. The White House also dropped a proposal to allow exploration in the eastern Gulf of Mexico within 125 miles of Florida, an area off limits due to a congressional moratorium. During 2010 negotiations, the administration offered to allow oil leasing in the region if Congress lifted the moratorium and passed a global warming bill. When the climate change legislation died, however, the drilling provision lost White House favor. Since the Republicans took control of the House in 2011, GOP leaders have advanced a series of bills that would go far beyond Obama's offshore oil drilling policies, essentially allowing development along all U.S. shores. But those measures have been thwarted by the Democrat-controlled Senate.

#### Plan causes fighting

Holt, **13,** David President of the Consumer Energy Alliance,

“Energy in the Next 4 Years,” <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2013/01/whats-ahead-in-2013-for-energy.php>

Given the partisan divide in Congress, enactment of significant energy or environmental legislation dealing with key issues such as energy efficiency, Renewable Fuels Standard reform, and offshore development, will be extremely difficult and Congressional oversight of the federal regulatory agencies will be highly partisan and largely ineffective.

## Iran Turn

### 1NC Iran Turn

**Low oil prices destroy Iran’s economy**

**Mehrara and Rezaza, 11**, Mohsen Associatee Professor and the University of Tehran and Abbas Islamic Azad University, Economics and Finance Review Vol. 1(5) pp. 44 – 56, “OIL REVENUES AND ECONOMIC GROWTH IN IRAN,” <http://www.businessjournalz.org/articlepdf/efr1507e.pdf>

The first to fourth specifications reflect the symmetric effects of positive and negative oil shocks on production. But if oil effects are asymmetric, the results of these models may be misleading. As it was explained in previous section, to examine and test the asymmetric effects of oil shocks on real production, oil revenue changes are divided into positive and negative ones and added as two explanatory variables to the growth model using Mork‟s methodology. Specifications 5 to 11 in Table (3) are estimated decomposition of oil shocks to positive (pos) and negative (neg) ones. As it can be seen by adding positive and negative shocks to the growth equation, the coefficient of determination significantly increases (from61% to 77%). In all cases, the negative oil shocks are much more effective than the positive oil shocks contemporaneously according to the size and statistical significance. Positive shocks in most cases are not significant or receive less importance than the negative oil shocks. In addition, negative oil shocks (based on the coefficient neg(1) ) enter with a positive sign and are statistically significant and affect GDP growth in the next period. Therefore, the lag of positive oil shocks (based on the coefficient pos(1)) is insignificant and is removed to improve in some specification. Moreover, the symmetry hypothesis implying the equal effects of positive and negative oil shocks is rejected based on Wald test. The estimation results from the above mentioned specifications indicate that long-run positive (ecmp) and negative (ecmn) imbalances also have asymmetric effects on economic growth. The size of coefficient of (ecmp), ranging from 0.02 to 0.03 is much less than the coefficient of (ecmn) which is estimated between0.12 to 0.17. In addition, coefficient of (ecmp) is not significant in any equation, while the (ecmn) has important effects on (decreasing) economic growth .Among asymmetric specifications, equation 11 enjoys the best base on ̅ , Akaike (AIC) and Schwartz (SIC) criteria. In most of the equations, the coefficients of the variables of the investment, are significant and of correct sign. The estimated growth equation 11 passes through all diagnostic tests (Heteroscedasticity, Ramsey‟s RESET test, autocorrelation and normality). In addition, the preferred specification is able to explain 77% of changes in GDP growth. Thus 23 percent of production changes are yet attributable to factors that are not included in the model. Due to severe structural changes in the sample period (especially Iran-Iraq War and Islamic Revolution) stability of structural coefficients based on the plot of cumulative sum of recursive residuals (CUSUM) and plot of cumulative sum of squares of recursive residuals (CUSUMSQ) have been used. The plot of CUSUM and CUSUMSQ statistics together with the 5% critical lines clearly indicates stability in equation and residual variance during the sample period.

**Iranian economic desperation causes war in the Middle East**

**Fishman, 12**, Alex, “Beware Iranian desperation,” http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4176675,00.html)

Everybody talks about the spring, because everyone is convinced that Israel will be striking Iran at that time, a move that will **ignite the Middle East**. The scenario is rather banal and emerges in every defense panel in the global media: This year, the Iranians will complete the task of moving their nuclear project deep underground, and from that moment an aerial strike would be much less effective. Hence, a strike appears to be required as soon as is possible.¶ However, there is another possibility that is **much more realistic, much closer to materializing**, and unrelated to an attack on Iran’s nuclear sites. This scenario asserts that the ones to first pull the trigger will be the Iranians, against the backdrop of Tehran’s economic chokehold and growing global isolation. Iran is starting to be pushed into a corner in the face of existing pressure, and more so as result of pressures to be exerted very soon.¶ Tehran’s economic collapse is already around the corner. The regime sees the thousands standing in line at banks these days in order to exchange the local currency for dollars – but there are none. On the black market, the gap already stands at 60%. Nobody can predict the breaking point that would prompt Ahmadinejad to act desperately; the point where the ayatollahs feel threatened enough to resort to a military provocation that would bully the world and exact such high price as to prompt the international community to lift the chokehold.

#### That results in global nuclear war

Russell, 09, James, Senior Lecturer Department of National Security Affairs, Spring, “Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East” Security Studies Center Proliferation Papers, http://www.analyst-network.com/articles/141/StrategicStabilityReconsideredProspectsforEscalationandNuclearWarintheMiddleEast.pdf

Strategic stability in the region is thus undermined by various factors: (1) asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors; (2) the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists; (3) incompatible assumptions about the structure of the deterrent relationship that makes the bargaining framework strategically unstable; (4) perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity for military action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack; (5) the prospect that Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States; (6) the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants. These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any the parties could happen either on purpose or as a result of miscalculation or the pressures of wartime circumstance. Given these factors, it is disturbingly easy to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could quickly escalate in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used in the context of an unstable strategic framework. Systemic asymmetries between actors in fact suggest a certain increase in the probability of war – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent such an outcome, which would be an unprecedented disaster for the peoples of the region, with substantial risk for the entire world.

## A2 Energy Leadership Advantage

### 1NC Energy Leadership High Now

#### Energy leadership is high now

Blackwill and O’Sullivan, 14 Robert D., Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy, and Meghan L., Jeane Kirkpatrick Professor of the Practice of International Affairs and Director of the Geopolitics of Energy Project at Harvard, “America’s Energy Edge: The Geopolitical Consequences of the Shale Revolution,” <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/140750/robert-d-blackwill-and-meghan-l-osullivan/americas-energy-edge>, ALB

Only five years ago, the world’s supply of oil appeared to be peaking, and as conventional gas production declined in the United States, it seemed that the country would become dependent on costly natural gas imports. But in the years since, those predictions have proved spectacularly wrong. Global energy production has begun to shift away from traditional suppliers in Eurasia and the Middle East, as producers tap unconventional gas and oil resources around the world, from the waters of Australia, Brazil, Africa, and the Mediterranean to the oil sands of Alberta. The greatest revolution, however, has taken place in the United States, where producers have taken advantage of two newly viable technologies to unlock resources once deemed commercially infeasible: horizontal drilling, which allows wells to penetrate bands of shale deep underground, and hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, which uses the injection of high-pressure fluid to release gas and oil from rock formations.¶ The resulting uptick in energy production has been dramatic. Between 2007 and 2012, U.S. shale gas production rose by over 50 percent each year, and its share of total U.S. gas production jumped from five percent to 39 percent. Terminals once intended to bring foreign liquefied natural gas (LNG) to U.S. consumers are being reconfigured to export U.S. LNG abroad. Between 2007 and 2012, fracking also generated an 18-fold increase in U.S. production of what is known as light tight oil, high-quality petroleum found in shale or sandstone that can be released by fracking. This boom has succeeded in reversing the long decline in U.S. crude oil production, which grew by 50 percent between 2008 and 2013. Thanks to these developments, the United States is now poised to become an energy superpower. Last year, it surpassed Russia as the world’s leading energy producer, and by next year, according to projections by the International Energy Agency, it will overtake Saudi Arabia as the top producer of crude oil.

And, overtake by other industries is NOT inevitable-U.S. predominance is here to stay

Blackwill and O’Sullivan, 14 Robert D., Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy, and Meghan L., Jeane Kirkpatrick Professor of the Practice of International Affairs and Director of the Geopolitics of Energy Project at Harvard, “America’s Energy Edge: The Geopolitical Consequences of the Shale Revolution,” <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/140750/robert-d-blackwill-and-meghan-l-osullivan/americas-energy-edge>, ALB

Much has been written lately about the discovery of new oil and gas deposits around the world, but other countries will not find it easy to replicate the United States’ success. The fracking revolution required more than just favorable geology; it also took financiers with a tolerance for risk, a property-rights regime that let landowners claim underground resources, a network of service providers and delivery infrastructure, and an industry structure characterized by thousands of entrepreneurs rather than a single national oil company. Although many countries possess the right rock, none, with the exception of Canada, boasts an industrial environment as favorable as that of the United States.

### 1NC Energy Independence Adv

#### Don’t have enough here

Ayres and Ayres, 09 Robert U. Ayres is emeritus professor of technology and economics at the European business school INSEAD, in Fountainbleau, France. Ed Ayres is a former editor of World Watch, 2009, <http://www.worldwatch.org/node/6225>

Historically, Americans have been strong on big ideas, but not always so strong on the devil in the detail. So, for example, public officials looking for alternatives to imported oil have widely embraced corn ethanol, even though a range of studies assessed by the Natural Resources Defense Council and others show that corn ethanol has a nearly zero net gain in energy output, while taking a heavy toll on human food-producing capacity. Or, many of those looking for "energy independence" still embrace the John McCain mantra to "drill, baby, drill," perhaps because the notion of increased domestic oil output comes across as a manly defiance of the Middle-Eastern chokehold on our gas pumps. More domestic oil might be an attractive concept, except that the numbers say it would add nothing to our energy supply in the next 10 years and would never come close to replacing imports. (The U.S. Department of Energy estimates that U.S. territories, including coastal waters, have 3 percent of the known remaining global oil reserves.) That latter fact has provided Al Gore and others an opening for their claim that renewables, in contrast to more oil drilling, could bring America to full energy independence in a decade. But that claim, too, betrays an embrace of broad concept that isn't completely realistic about numbers.

#### Drilling can’t solve prices in the short term

**Weiss 11** Daniel J. MPP, Senior Fellow and Director of Climate Strategy at Center for American Progress, 2/2/11, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2011/02/02/9122/the-false-promise-of-drill-baby-drill/>

Yet more drilling would provide zero relief from high oil and gasoline prices now, and make a scant difference in 10 years. The Energy Information Administration noted that the “long lead times from discovery to production limit the increase in production, particularly offshore.” This means that an increase in U.S. oil production will make little or no difference in the world oil price or what Americans pay at the gas pump. Ken Green, resident scholar with the conservative American Enterprise Institute, has explained that crude oil is a global commodity whose price will be unaffected by new U.S. production. Greenwire reported that: “The world price is the world price. Even if we were producing 100 percent of our oil,” Green said, if prices increase because of a shortage in China or India, “our price would go up to the same thing…We probably couldn’t produce enough to affect the world price of oil,” he added. “People don’t understand that.” Two weeks ago, Green astutely predicted that some politicians would exploit higher oil prices to boost Big Oil’s desire to drill on fragile lands and in coastal waters. “We’re likely to see a replay of the McCain-Palin ‘drill, baby, drill,’ ‘drill here, drill now.’ It will probably be a cause célèbre for the tea party.” In reality, there are very few measures that government can undertake to offset price hikes in the short term. There are, however, two proven solutions that would reduce demand and prices. If oil and gasoline prices rise to unbearable levels—say $120 per barrel or $4 per gallon at the pump—the administration can reduce prices by selling oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve—currently at its full capacity of 727 million barrels of oil. Each 1 million barrels put on the world market per day would increase the oil supply by more than 1 percent, putting downward pressure on prices. Previous emergency SPR sales had an immediate impact. President George W. Bush ordered the sale of SPR oil to keep prices down once they hit $69 per barrel after Hurricane Katrina. The SPR oil was on the market in 17 days, and prices dropped 12 percent in a month. Another immediate action the government could take would be to use some of the proceeds from selling SPR oil to pay for public transportation trips to encourage people to drive less. For instance, selling a half a million barrels of SPR oil per day for a month at an average price of $120 per barrel would raise $1.8 billion. This could pay for an additional 1.6 billion transit trips, saving 800 million gallons of gasoline.[1] Lastly, the Commodities Future Trading Commission must have the staff it needs to enforce new safeguards to prevent speculators from driving up oil prices as they did in 2008. More oil drilling cannot meet our long-term energy needs either. The United States has only 2 percent of the world’s oil reserves, yet we use one-quarter of the oil produced annually even if we were drilling everywhere, including wildlife refuges, off beaches, and other fragile places. We cannot produce enough oil domestically to significantly reduce our dependence on foreign oil. Our consumption helps finance and sustain unfriendly regimes because one in five barrels of oil consumed in the United States comes from countries that the State Department considers to be “dangerous or unstable.”

**Can’t solve energy independence**

**CE, 08,** “Offshore Drilling: A False Answer to Energy Prices”, http://www.usclimatenetwork.org/resource-database/offshore-drilling-a-false-answer-to-energy-prices

¶ Drilling will not lead to energy independence. ¶  The amount of oil available offshore (in the Atlantic and Eastern Gulf) would only last the United States ¶ about 13 months at present rates of consumption. ¶  The United States is responsible for 24% of total global oil consumption, but we only provide 6% of ¶ total world oil production and hold only 2.5% of the world’s oil reserves. ¶  The United States imports more than two-thirds of our daily oil needs.

**Not enough oil to solve energy independence – can only last 2-3 years Not enough oil to solve energy independence – can only last 2-3 years**

**SA, 08,** Scientific American, “Can Offshore Drilling Really Make the U.S. Oil Independent?”, http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/can-offshore-drilling-make-us-independent/

**SA, 08,** Scientific American, “Can Offshore Drilling Really Make the U.S. Oil Independent?”, http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/can-offshore-drilling-make-us-independent/

¶ When Arizona Sen. John McCain accepted the Republican nomination for president, he vowed to cut America's reliance on foreign oil by opening up the nation's Atlantic and Pacific coasts to drilling—drawing cheers from GOP delegates on hand for his party's national convention. "We will drill new oil wells offshore, and we'll drill them now," McCain pledged to his faithful, who gushed with enthusiastic chants of "drill, baby, drill!" The ultimate goal, the candidate said: to "stop sending $700 billion a year (for oil) to countries that don't like us very much."¶ No one disputes that a lot of oil lies untapped under the rocky floors of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans off the U.S. coasts, in areas where Congress has banned drilling since 1982. But is it enough to free the U.S. from its dependence on foreign suppliers?¶ The [Minerals Management Service](http://www.mms.gov/) (MMS), is the part of the U.S. Department of the Interior responsible for leasing tracts to oil and gas companies and collecting the royalties on them, which amount to around $8 billion a year. The leases are supposed to be awarded through a competitive bidding process, in which the best-qualified company coming in with the highest split of royalties wins. (The [Interior Department](http://www.doioig.gov/)'s inspector general, however, released a scathing report on September 10 charging that 19 current and past officials in the MMS's Denver-based [Royalty in Kind program](http://www.mrm.mms.gov/RIKweb/default.htm)were both literally and figuratively [in bed with energy company execs](http://www.sciam.com/blog/60-second-science/index.cfm?&offset=11). The [IG report](http://www.doioig.gov/upload/RIK%20REDACTED%20FINAL4_082008%20with%20transmittal%209_10%20date.pdf)describes "[a culture of ethical failure](http://www.doioig.gov/upload/Qui%20tam.pdf)" in which staffers accepted vacations and other pricey gifts from oil companies, rigged contracts, did drugs with one another and had sex with industry reps.¶ The MMS has estimated that there are around 18 billion barrels in the underwater areas now off-limits to drilling. That's significantly less than in oil fields open for business in the Gulf of Mexico, coastal Alaska and off the coast of southern California, where there are 10.1 billion barrels of known oil reserves as well as an estimated 85.9 billion more.¶ To put these numbers in perspective: [one U.S. barrel of oil](http://www.eia.doe.gov/basics/quickoil.html) equals 42 gallons (159 liters) and, according to the [Energy Information Administration](http://www.eia.doe.gov/) (an arm of the U.S. Department of Energy that provides energy data and analysis), the U.S. consumes some 20.8 million barrels of oil a day—almost one quarter of the [87 million used worldwide](http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/ieo/highlights.html). That adds up to 7.59 billion barrels a year.¶ The EIA estimates that by 2030, [U.S. oil daily demand](http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/aeo/demand.html) will climb to nearly 23 million barrels, with global per-day consumption expected to top 118 million.

**Their evidence overestimates what we extract – only some oil is recoverable**

**SA, 08,** Scientific American, “Can Offshore Drilling Really Make the U.S. Oil Independent?”, http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/can-offshore-drilling-make-us-independent/

What's more, industry experts say no matter how much oil there may be offshore, only some of it will be "recoverable," that is, able to be removed at a cost that's cheap enough to guarantee oil companies enough profit on their investment. Current shortages of both oil rigs and skilled manpower to operate them could also bottleneck such efforts.¶ According to Phyllis Martin, a senior EIA energy analyst, Atlantic and Pacific oil fields tend to be smaller on average than those in the Gulf of Mexico, but it is just as costly to drill them, making the economics of drilling these areas especially tough to justify.¶ In fact, oil companies have yet to take advantage of the nearly 86 billion barrels of offshore oil in areas already available for leasing and development. So why are they chomping at the drill bit to open up the moratorium waters and survey them anew?¶ "Oil company stocks are valued in large part based on how much proved reserves they have," says Robert Kaufman, an expert on world oil markets and director of Boston University's Center for Energy and Environmental Studies. Translation: just having more promising leases in hand would be worth billions of dollars.¶ So are promises of U.S. oil independence real—or rhetoric? The issue is not whether the U.S. can significantly reduce its reliance on oil imports with domestic, offshore oil, say both Kaufman and Nathan, but whether there is enough that is recoverable to significantly lower the price of a barrel of oil on the global market.

### A2: Price Shock Insulation

#### Drilling doesn’t insulate the US from price shocks

**Luft and Korin, 12**, Gal Luft and Anne Korin are co-directors of the Institute for the Analysis of Global Security (IAGS) and senior advisers to the United States Energy Security Council. They are co-authors of Turning Oil into Salt: Energy Independence through Fuel Choice (2009) and Petropoly: The Collapse of America’s Energy Security Paradigm (Forthcoming, 2012)., July/August 2012, "The Folly of Energy Independence", [www.the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=1266](http://www.the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=1266)

All but two of the post-World War II recessions were preceded by a sharp spike in oil prices; there is no question that the fivefold increase in oil prices since 2003 has contributed to the current economic dislocation. For perspective, forty years ago, at the zenith of the Cold War, the United States spent $4 billion on oil imports, an amount that equaled 1.2 percent of the defense budget. In 2006, the United States paid $296 billion, equal to half of the defense budget. By 2008, U.S. foreign oil expenditures grew so much they almost equaled the entire defense budget. The energy security paradox of the 21st century, then, is that a country can reduce oil imports but end up paying a much higher oil import bill. What this means is that, given the current state of the global economy, a new oil shock—whether caused by war in the Persian Gulf, instability in North Africa or Nigeria, or even anxious investors rushing to buy oil futures to hedge against falling currencies—would sink Western economies. As it is, the rising cost of oil is hollowing out the U.S. economy, and no fuel economy standards or new oil discovery will stop this tide. What is needed is a new energy paradigm. As we have already noted, dreams of autarky in oil still dominate U.S. energy policy discourse. The pledge to cut a third of oil imports by 2020 is at the core of President Obama’s energy policy, and talk about reducing imports from the Middle East continues to be one of the best applause lines of all presidential and congressional candidates across the political spectrum. This rhetoric relies on two false premises. First, America is not dependent on the Persian Gulf for its oil supply. Imports from the Persian Gulf never exceeded 15 percent of total U.S. petroleum consumption; currently, the figure stands at 9 percent. And again, these numbers are really nominal, since oil is fungible and swap arrangements the oil companies employ to reduce transportation costs make it impossible to know where any given barrel of oil really came from. Most U.S. oil imports originate in North America. Second, even if all U.S. oil imports originated from Canada and Mexico, America would be just as vulnerable to the impact of oil price spikes due to volatility in the Persian Gulf and other unstable regions as it is today. Self-sufficiency in oil would not, indeed cannot, shield U.S. consumers from oil price shocks. In 2008, when oil prices reached an historic high, the United Kingdom produced most of the oil it needed, yet the price spike affected its citizens just as much as it did Americans. When the price of oil spikes, it spikes for everyone. The United States imports hardly any oil from Libya, but when the 2011 Libyan upheavals caused a supply disruption, American motorists were as affected by the resulting $25 per barrel price hike as the motorists of Libya’s major oil purchasers.

### A2: Solves Warming

#### Gas trades-off with wind and solar power – it isn’t a bridge.

Jenkins and Trembath, 12, Jesse Jenkins and Alex Trembath are Director and Policy Associate, respectively, with the Breakthrough Institute's Energy and Climate Program, Avoiding a Natural Gas Bridge to Nowhere, JANUARY 19, 2012, http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/01/whats-ahead-for-natural-gas.php

Cheap gas simultaneously puts pressure on higher-cost nuclear, wind, and solar energy, however. If cheap gas leads to complacency in the development of sustainable, low-carbon electricity sources, today’s gas boon may become tomorrow’s curse, as natural gas eclipses not only coal, but also cleaner, carbon-free energy sources. An increasingly dominant role for natural gas in America’s energy mix also exposes the United States to the inherent volatility of natural gas markets. As a gas, methane flows much faster from wells than crude oil. Natural gas wells thus produce and deplete quite rapidly, with roughly 50 percent of a typical well’s lifetime production expended in the first three or four years. This basic dynamic of rapid production and depletion often leads to a boom-bust cycle in markets, as anyone observing North American natural gas markets over the past half century can attest. If North America begins to export large quantities of natural gas, this inherent volatility will only be exacerbated. The future of natural gas is unlikely to part with this history of boom and bust – unless the United States once again commits to long-term investment in the development of affordable, clean, domestic energy technologies. Without significant and strategic investments in next-generation solar, wind, nuclear, and electric vehicles, there’s every reason to believe the natural gas revolution will continue and gas will ultimately become an increasingly dominant share of the U.S. energy supply. The result will likely be near-term declines in CO2 and pollutants along with growing reliance on another volatile and increasingly costly fossil energy source. The shale gas “bridge fuel” may well become a bridge to nowhere.

#### Can’t solve – not used in cars

Ratner, Parfomak and Luther, 11, Michael Ratner, Analyst in Energy Policy, Paul W. Parfomak, Specialist in Energy and Infrastructure Policy, Linda Luther, Analyst in Environmental Policy, U.S. Natural Gas Exports: New Opportunities, Uncertain Outcomes, CRS Service, November 4, 2011, http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/R42074\_20111104.pdf

Electric power generation represents potentially the greatest increase in natural gas consumption in the U.S. economy, primarily for environmental reasons. Natural gas emits much less carbon dioxide and other pollutants than coal when combusted. Other types of consumption are not likely to increase natural gas demand domestically for a long time. Use in the transportation sector to displace oil is likely to be small because expensive new infrastructure and technologies would be required. There is discussion of a possible revival of the U.S. petrochemicals sector, but the potential extent of a change is unclear. Getting natural gas to markets where it can be consumed, whether domestically or internationally, is the industry’s biggest challenge. Infrastructure constraints, environmental regulations, and other factors will influence how the market adjusts to balance supply and demand. Environmental groups are split regarding natural gas use, with some favoring increased use to curb emissions of certain pollutants, while others oppose expanded use of natural gas because it is not as clean as renewable forms of energy, such as wind or solar. The use of hydraulic fracturing to produce shale gas has also raised concerns among environmental groups particularly concerned with its possible impacts on water quality.

#### That’s key to solve warming

West, 12, Larry, 20-year professional writer and editor who has written many articles about environmental issues for leading newspapers, magazines and online publications citing from: John DeCicco, author of the report and senior fellow at Environmental Defense, “U.S. Autos Account for Half of Global Warming Linked to Cars Worldwide,” http://environment.about.com/od/globalwarming/a/autoemissions.htm

U.S. automobiles and light trucks are responsible for nearly half of all greenhouse gases emitted by automobiles globally, according to a new study by Environmental Defense.The study, Global Warming on the Road [PDF], also found that the Big Three automakers—General Motors, Ford and DaimlerChrysler—accounted for nearly three-quarters of the carbon dioxide released by cars and pickup trucks on U.S. roads in 2004, the latest year for which statistics were available.“Cutting greenhouse gas emissions from U.S. automobiles will be critical to any strategy for slowing global warming,” said John DeCicco, author of the report and senior fellow at Environmental Defense, in a press release. “To address global warming, we’ll need a clear picture of what sources are contributing to the problem. This report details, by automaker and vehicle type, the greenhouse gas contributions from America's auto sector, for the first time.”Carbon dioxide emissions from personal vehicles in the United States equaled 314 million metric tons in 2004. That much carbon could fill a coal train 55,000 miles long—long enough to circle the Earth twice. Cars and trucks made by GM gave off 99 million metric tons of carbon dioxide or 31 percent of the total; Ford vehicles emitted 80 million metric tons or 25 percent; and Daimler Chrysler vehicles emitted 51 million metric tons or 16 percent, according to the report.

#### Still releases CO2 – can’t solve

Moniz et al, 11, Ernest J, Chair, MIT Interdisciplinary Study, 6/09/2011, The Future of Natural Gas http://web.mit.edu/mitei/research/studies/natural-gas-2011.shtml

Natural gas is the cleanest burning fossil fuel, enhancing its desirability as a fuel option in a carbon-constrained environment. As a fossil fuel, however, natural gas also emits greenhouse gases (GHG), including CO2 emissions from gas combustion and CO2 and methane emissions from the gas system, including production, processing, transmission and distribution. According to EPA inventories released in 2010, in 2008 GHG emissions from natural gas systems were 126 teragrams (one teragram is equivalent to one million metric tons) of CO2 equivalents (CO2 e), less than 2% of total CO2 equivalent emissions from energy sources and activities. Of this total, 96 teragrams of CO2 e were CH4 emissions; the remainder are from non-combustion CO2 . The draft EPA inventory, released in late February 2011, doubled the EPA’s estimates of methane emissions from gas systems for 2008. A breakout of EPA’s estimated emissions from gas systems is seen in Figure 6.2 (from EPA’s revised draft inventory estimates also discussed in Appendix 1A). Methane leaks from gas systems, particularly at the levels indicated by the new EPA estimates, could prompt efforts to capture those emissions for both environmental and business reasons. Reducing emissions from well completions can, for example, create value for producers and can have a very short payback period (3 to 8 months). 5 While many larger producers and pipelines have already deployed relatively inexpensive methane detection and capture technologies and are able to realize proﬁts from use of these technologies, smaller producers may need new, more affordable technologies to detect and capture methane emissions.

### Warming Defense

Warming won’t cause extinction

Barrett 07, professor of natural resource economics – Columbia University

(Scott, Why Cooperate? The Incentive to Supply Global Public Goods, introduction)

First, climate change does not threaten the survival of the human species.5 If unchecked, it will cause other species to become extinction (though biodiversity is being depleted now due to other reasons). It will alter critical ecosystems (though this is also happening now, and for reasons unrelated to climate change). It will reduce land area as the seas rise, and in the process displace human populations. “Catastrophic” climate change is possible, but not certain. Moreover, and unlike an asteroid collision, large changes (such as sea level rise of, say, ten meters) will likely take centuries to unfold, giving societies time to adjust. “Abrupt” climate change is also possible, and will occur more rapidly, perhaps over a decade or two. However, abrupt climate change (such as a weakening in the North Atlantic circulation), though potentially very serious, is unlikely to be ruinous. Human-induced climate change is an experiment of planetary proportions, and we cannot be sur of its consequences. Even in a worse case scenario, however, global climate change is not the equivalent of the Earth being hit by mega-asteroid. Indeed, if it were as damaging as this, and if we were sure that it would be this harmful, then our incentive to address this threat would be overwhelming. The challenge would still be more difficult than asteroid defense, but we would have done much more about it by now.

**Newest studies prove – no impact for 1.5 billion years**

Spotts 13 – Spotts is a graduate of the University of Miami in Coral Gables, Fla and a writer for CSM since 1976(Pete, “When would global warming destroy life on Earth? Study hazards a guess.” [http://www.csmonitor.com/Science/2013/0730/When-would-global-warming-destroy-life-on-Earth-Study-hazards-a-guess)\*\*we](http://www.csmonitor.com/Science/2013/0730/When-would-global-warming-destroy-life-on-Earth-Study-hazards-a-guess)**we) reject gendered language used in this evidence

The most recent of the two studies, published Monday in the journal Nature Geoscience, found that the amount of energy needed to shift a planet's climate into thermal overdrive at Earth's distance from the sun was about 10 percent less than estimates many scientists have been using for more than two decades. The research suggests that from a standpoint of Earth's climate, it would likely take another 1.5 billion years, even accounting for the pace at which human activities(SIC) are pumping greenhouse gases into the air, for a runaway greenhouse effect to take over, says Colin Goldblatt, an assistant professor at the University of Victoria in British Columbia who studies the evolution of Earth's climate. The results also imply that a star's habitable zone – where a planet could capture enough warmth from its sun to allow liquid water to remain stable on the surface – may be smaller than previously estimated. If the results hold up, this would reduce the number of extrasolar planets deemed potentially habitable. The study serves as a useful reminder that scientists can't determine habitability only from estimates of how much radiation reaches a planet, says Larry Esposito, a researcher who studies planetary atmospheres at the University of Colorado at Boulder. A planet's current climate and the history of that climate play key roles, too. The atmospheric model used in looking at the greenhouse effect on Earth represents "a first pass at doing the problem again," says Dr. Goldblatt. It doesn't account for clouds, which would be crucial to determining the mount of sunlight reaching Earth's surface. Instead, the model operates assuming clear skies. "You start off with simple models. You try to understand the answers. Then you go on to more complex models," he says.Over the past 25 years, researchers have developed more-detailed measurements of water vapor and how it interacts with the infrared radiation the Earth's surface sends skyward. These improvements prompted the team to try to take another crack at measuring the energy needed to trigger a runaway greenhouse effect. Water vapor and other greenhouse gases absorb most of that radiation and re-radiate it in all directions, including back toward Earth's surface. But radiation in a narrow band of wavelengths can escape, allowing some of that heat to head back toward space. As the atmosphere warms, more water evaporates, and the atmosphere's ability to hold moisture increases. Runaway heating can occur when warming temperatures push enough water vapor into the air to in effect slam the infrared window shut, Goldblatt explains. Nor is sunlight alone in determining the surface temperature. A study published earlier this year in the journal Astrobiology described how tidal heating – the friction created within a planet as it is tugged by a star's gravity – could produce enough heat at the planet's surface to push an otherwise stable climate into runaway greenhouse warming. Runaway heating from these tidal forces would be limited to planets orbiting dim, low-mass red-dwarf stars along highly elliptical paths. Those paths might take the planet into and out of the star's habitable zone. While the planet might eventually stabilize in a circular orbit within a habitable zone, it would be bone-dry. he team, led by Rory Barnes, a research scientist at the University of Washington in Seattle, dubbed these runaway-heating victims "tidal Venuses." [Editor's note: The original version of this story misspelled the name of Rory Barnes.] For the more familiar Venus, the modeling Goldblatt and colleagues undertook imply that the planet may never have had oceans to begin with – unless the levels of nitrogen in its atmosphere were comparable to the relatively high levels seen today, Dr. Espositio suggests. Nitrogen is effective at scattering visible light and so would tend to be a cooling agent if it was present in sufficient amounts. Though the study would seem to rule out any immanent runaway greenhouse effect on Earth, Goldblatt underscores the importance of reining in global warming. "There is this thing known as a runaway greenhouse effect. It is easier than we thought to cause it. But it's not something that's likely to happen in the context of anthropogenic global change," he says. "But the flip side of that is that we really do need to still worry about anthropogenic global change. It's still a really big deal."

#### We’ll adapt to warming

**Kenny 12** [April 9, 2012, Charles, senior fellow at the Center for Global Development, a Schwartz fellow at the New America Foundation, and author, most recently, of Getting Better: Why Global Development Is Succeeding and How We Can Improve the World Even More., “Not Too Hot to Handle,” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/04/09/not\_too\_hot\_to\_handle?print=yes&hidecomments=yes&page=full]

But for all international diplomats appear desperate to affirm the self-worth of pessimists and doomsayers worldwide, it is important to put climate change in a broader context. It is a vital global issue -- one that threatens to slow the worldwide march toward improved quality of life. Climate change is already responsible for more extreme weather and an accelerating rate of species extinction -- and may ultimately kill off as many as 40 percent of all living species. But it is also a problem that we know how to tackle, and one to which we have some time to respond before it is likely to completely derail progress. And that's good news, because the fact that it's manageable is the best reason to try to tackle it rather than abandon all hope like a steerage class passenger in the bowels of the Titanic.¶ Start with the economy. The Stern Review, led by the distinguished British economist Nicholas Stern, is the most comprehensive look to date at the economics of climate change. It suggests that, in terms of income, greenhouse gasses are a threat to global growth, but hardly an immediate or catastrophic one. Take the impact of climate change on the developing world. The most depressing forecast in terms of developing country growth in Stern's paper is the "A2 scenario" -- one of a series of economic and greenhouse gas emissions forecasts created for the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). It's a model that predicts slow global growth and income convergence (poor countries catching up to rich countries). But even under this model, Afghanistan's GDP per capita climbs sixfold over the next 90 years, India and China ninefold, and Ethiopia's income increases by a factor of 10. Knock off a third for the most pessimistic simulation of the economic impact of climate change suggested by the Stern report, and people in those countries are still markedly better off -- four times as rich for Afghanistan, a little more than six times as rich for Ethiopia.¶ It's worth emphasizing that the Stern report suggests that the costs of dramatically reducing greenhouse-gas emissions is closer to 1 (or maybe 2) percent of world GDP -- in the region of $600 billion to $1.2 trillion today. The economic case for responding to climate change by pricing carbon and investing in alternate energy sources is a slam dunk. But for all the likelihood that the world will be a poorer, denuded place than it would be if we responded rapidly to reduce greenhouse gases, the global economy is probably not going to collapse over the next century even if we are idiotic enough to delay our response to climate change by a few years. For all the flooding, the drought, and the skyrocketing bills for air conditioning, the economy would keep on expanding, according to the data that Stern uses.¶ And what about the impact on global health? Suggestions that malaria has already spread as a result of climate change and that malaria deaths will expand dramatically as a result of warming in the future don't fit the evidence of declining deaths and reduced malarial spread over the last century. The authors of a recent study published in the journal Nature conclude that the forecasted future effects of rising temperatures on malaria "are at least one order of magnitude smaller than the changes observed since about 1900 and about two orders of magnitude smaller than those that can be achieved by the effective scale-up of key control measures." In other words, climate change is and will likely remain a small factor in the toll of malaria deaths into the foreseeable future.¶ What about other diseases? Christian Zimmermann at the University of Connecticut and Douglas Gollin at Williams evaluate the likely impact of a 3-degree rise in temperatures on tropical diseases like dengue fever, which causes half a million cases of hemorrhagic fever and 22,000 deaths each year. Most of the vectors for such diseases -- mosquitoes, biting flies, and so on -- do poorly in frost. So if the weather stays warmer, these diseases are likely to spread. At the same time, there are existing tools to prevent or treat most tropical diseases, and Zimmerman and Gollin suggest "rather modest improvements in protection efficacy could compensate for the consequences of climate change." We can deal with this one.¶ It's the same with agriculture. Global warming will have many negative (and a few positive) impacts on food supply, but it is likely that other impacts -- both positive, including technological change, and negative, like the exhaustion of aquifers-- will have far bigger effects. The 2001 IPCC report suggested that climate change over the long term could reduce agricultural yields by as much as 30 percent. Compare that with the 90 percent increase in rice yields in Indonesia between 1970 and 2006, for example.¶ Again, while climate change will make extreme weather events and natural disasters like flooding and hurricanes more common, the negative effect on global quality of life will be reduced if economies continue to grow. That's because, as Matthew Kahn from Tufts University has shown, the safest place to suffer a natural disaster is in a rich country. The more money that people and governments have, the more they can both afford and enforce building codes, land use regulations, and public infrastructure like flood defenses that lower death tolls.¶ Let's also not forget how human psychology works. Too many environmentalists suggest that dealing with climate change will take immediate and radical retooling of the global economy. It won't. It is affordable, practical, and wouldn't take a revolution. Giving out the message that the only path to sustainability will require medieval standards of living only puts everyone else off. And once you've convinced yourself the world is on an inevitable course to disaster if some corner of the U.S. Midwest is fracked once more or India builds another three coal-fueled power plants, the only logical thing to do when the fracking or the building occurs is to sit back, put your Toms shoes on the couch, and drink micro-brewed herbal tea until civilization collapses. Climate change isn't like that -- or at the very least, isn't like that yet.¶ So, if you're really just looking for a reason to strap on the "end of the world is nigh" placards and go for a walk, you can find better excuses -- like, say, the threat of global thermonuclear war or a rogue asteroid. The fight to curb greenhouse gas emissions is one for the hard-nosed optimist.

#### Tech and adaptive advances prevent all climate impacts---warming won’t cause war

Dr. S. Fred Singer et al 11, Research Fellow at The Independent Institute, Professor Emeritus of Environmental Sciences at the University of Virginia, President of the Science and Environmental Policy Project, a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and a Member of the International Academy of Astronautics; Robert M. Carter, Research Professor at James Cook University (Queensland) and the University of Adelaide (South Australia), palaeontologist, stratigrapher, marine geologist and environmental scientist with more than thirty years professional experience; and Craig D. Idso, founder and chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences, and Association of American Geographers, et al, 2011, “Climate Change Reconsidered: 2011 Interim Report,” online: <http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/FrontMatter.pdf>

Decades-long empirical trends of climate-sensitive measures of human well-being, including the percent of developing world population suffering from chronic hunger, poverty rates, and deaths due to extreme weather events, reveal dramatic improvement during the twentieth century, notwithstanding the historic increase in atmospheric CO2 concentrations. The magnitude of the impacts of climate change on human well-being depends on society's adaptability (adaptive capacity), which is determined by, among other things, the wealth and human resources society can access in order to obtain, install, operate, and maintain technologies necessary to cope with or take advantage of climate change impacts. The IPCC systematically underestimates adaptive capacity by failing to take into account the greater wealth and technological advances that will be present at the time for which impacts are to be estimated. Even accepting the IPCC's and Stern Review's worst-case scenarios, and assuming a compounded annual growth rate of per-capita GDP of only 0.7 percent, reveals that net GDP per capita in developing countries in 2100 would be double the 2006 level of the U.S. and triple that level in 2200. Thus, even developing countries' future ability to cope with climate change would be much better than that of the U.S. today. The IPCC's embrace of biofuels as a way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions was premature, as many researchers have found "even the best biofuels have the potential to damage the poor, the climate, and biodiversity" (Delucchi, 2010). Biofuel production consumes nearly as much energy as it generates, competes with food crops and wildlife for land, and is unlikely to ever meet more than a small fraction of the world's demand for fuels. The notion that global warming might cause war and social unrest is not only wrong, but even backwards - that is, global cooling has led to wars and social unrest in the past, whereas global warming has coincided with periods of peace, prosperity, and social stability.

## A2 Econ Advantage

### A2: Solves Economy

#### Can’t solve economy – doesn’t solve unemployment

**Levi, 11,** Michael CFR Energy Security and Climate Change Program Director, Senior Fellow, “New Energy Jobs Won't Solve the U.S. Unemployment Problem”, www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136599/michael-levi/new-energy-jobs-wont-solve-the-us-unemployment-problem

U.S. President Barack Obama and the leading Republican candidates for president don't agree on much, particularly when it comes to jobs and energy. But they do appear to share a conviction that a vibrant energy sector is central to solving the U.S. unemployment problem. Obama has put clean energy jobs at the center of his economic message. On the Republican side, both Texas Governor Rick Perry and Mitt Romney, his rival, claim that the oil, gas, and coal industries is where the real future of American job growth lies, contrasting their approach with one that has produced the recent Solyndra debacle. Alas, on the one point on which everyone seemingly agrees, they are all wrong. There is no doubt the energy sector could employ many more Americans. But exactly how many matters. The Republican candidates have made bold and concrete predictions. Perry is running on his record of job creation in Texas, which included a big boost from the booming oil and gas sector employment. Romney claims that expanded drilling could create 1.2 million energy jobs and that shale gas operations in the Northeast could add another 280,000 and Perry offers similar numbers. This is an exaggeration. The American Petroleum Institute, which is hardly an impartial arbiter (it is the oil industry lobby), projects that opening all U.S. lands to drilling while loosening a range of regulations would create 400,000 new energy-sector jobs and perhaps one million support and spinoff jobs by 2030. The real potential for oil and gas jobs is smaller. For his part, Obama placed clean-energy jobs at the core of his economic recovery plans, promising five million by 2030 if his energy plans were enacted into law. The Center for American Progress, a liberal-leaning think tank that is inclined to be favorable to the president, estimated that his plans could have actually created about 1.8 million jobs at clean-energy businesses and their suppliers. Either way, Republicans and some Democrats have blocked most of the clean energy policies that the president advocated. The problem is that even if Obama, Perry, and Romney all had their way and, in fact, created millions of energy sector jobs, these numbers would be incommensurate with the scale of the United States' current employment challenge. In a country where 14 million job seekers are unemployed and an additional 9.3 million are involuntarily working part time, energy jobs will not bridge the gap. And many, if not most, of the promised jobs -- whether in oil drilling or turbine manufacturing -- would take more than a decade to materialize. Setting aside such problems, the full complement of jobs promised by the American Petroleum Institute and the Center for American Progress would tweak unemployment by about one percent. All of this also fails to mention that in the longer term, many if not most of the new jobs would come at the expense of employment in other sectors, pushing those job creation numbers down even further. The underwhelming numbers should not be surprising. After all, energy production is not a large part of the U.S. economy. The mining sector -- which includes oil, gas, and coal production -- makes up only 1.9 percent of U.S. GDP. The utilities sector, which includes both clean and traditional energy production as well as a wide range of other activities, adds another 1.9 percent. Motor vehicle manufacturing accounts for 0.9 percent more. This is nothing to scoff at -- in real terms it means nearly a trillion dollars per year -- but national prosperity will not come from jobs growth in sectors that collectively make up less than five percent of the economy.

**Not enough jobs are created to affect the economy**

**Krugman, 12,** Paul joined The New York Times in 1999 as a columnist on the Op-Ed Page and continues as professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton University. Mr. Krugman received his B.A. from Yale University in 1974 and his Ph.D. from MIT in 1977. He has taught at Yale, MIT and Stanford. At MIT he became the Ford International Professor of Economics., "Natural Born Drillers", [www.nytimes.com/2012/03/16/opinion/krugman-natural-born-drillers.html?\_r=2&partner=rss&emc=rss](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/16/opinion/krugman-natural-born-drillers.html?_r=2&partner=rss&emc=rss)

Meanwhile, what about jobs? I have to admit that I started laughing when I saw The Wall Street Journal offering North Dakota as a role model. Yes, the oil boom there has pushed unemployment down to 3.2 percent, but that’s only possible because the whole state has fewer residents than metropolitan Albany — so few residents that adding a few thousand jobs in the state’s extractive sector is a really big deal. The comparable-sized fracking boom in Pennsylvania has had hardly any effect on the state’s overall employment picture, because, in the end, not that many jobs are involved. And this tells us that giving the oil companies carte blanche isn’t a serious jobs program. Put it this way: Employment in oil and gas extraction has risen more than 50 percent since the middle of the last decade, but that amounts to only 70,000 jobs, around one-twentieth of 1 percent of total U.S. employment. So the idea that drill, baby, drill can cure our jobs deficit is basically a joke.

**At best affects 0.2% of growth**

**Levi, 11,** Michael A. Levi David M. Rubenstein Senior Fellow for Energy and the Environment, "Do America’s Future Jobs Lie in Traditional Energy?", blogs.cfr.org/levi/2011/09/28/do-americas-future-jobs-lie-in-traditional-energy/

Ultimately, though, a sense of scale is essential. This blog shared some back of the envelope numbers a couple weeks ago that suggested that a massive extractives boom might at best add about 0.2% directly to national GDP growth, barring very big increases in the price of oil and other mined commodities. That’s not the sort of thing that makes a decisive difference to employment. Potentially more important is the possible impact on oil prices (in tandem with steadily more aggressive fuel economy standards), though again, it’s difficult to paint a picture where U.S. actions yield overwhelming change. Bright spots are always welcome where people are struggling, but it’s dangerous to extrapolate them to a point that yields false hope.

### Prices Low

**Prices on the decline – worries of Iraq were resolved**

**AP, 14,** “Oil prices slip as U.S. deploys small force to Iraq”, Jun 17, http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/money/58078548-79/oil-iraq-crude-agency.html.csp

¶ ¶ The price of oil eased slightly Tuesday after the U.S. said it was deploying a small group of troops to Iraq, which helped soothe fears somewhat over the prospect of disruption to crude supplies.¶ By mid-afternoon in Europe, benchmark U.S crude for July delivery was down 18 cents to $106.72 a barrel on the New York Mercantile Exchange. Brent crude, a benchmark used to price international oils, was up 12 cents to $113.06 a barrel on the ICE Futures exchange in London.¶ Up to 275 U.S. soldiers are being positioned in and around Iraq to protect the U.S. Embassy and other American interests as President Barack Obama weighs options for dealing with the al-Qaeda inspired militants who have captured a vast swath of the country’s north.¶ Iraq’s crude oil exports have so far not been disrupted but the conflict raises concern about whether the country can rebuild its oil infrastructure and meet global demand.¶ The International Energy Agency, which acts as a consultancy to developed economies, said its members’ oil reserves were at a "comfortable level" and that the agency was ready to respond quickly to any supply disruptions caused by the turmoil in Iraq.¶ "At this moment, not a single barrel of oil has been displaced compared to a week ago," IEA Executive Director Maria van der Hoeven said after the release of the agency’s medium-term oil market report. "But of course you can see that the market is worried."¶

**Prices aren’t rising – stabilizing after Iraq**

**CNBC, 14,** June 14, “Markets ‘on edge’ over ‘eerie calm’ in oil prices”, http://www.cnbc.com/id/101761295

A sudden outburst of violence in Iraq has seen oil traders send Brent crude prices to near-nine-month highs amid fears over the country's oil supplies, but BP's chief economist says increased production in the United States **will help keep oil prices relatively stable**.¶ Both Brent and WTI were slightly higher in early Monday trade, though they also wobbled briefly into negative territory as well.¶ Iraq produces about 3.3 million barrels a day, and so far the only reported disruption is the flow of oil through the 600,000 barrel Kirkuk-Ceyhan pipeline, which runs from Kirkuk to Turkey. The Kirkuk fields produce about 400,000 to 500,000 barrels a day, while the major fields in the Basra area produce about 2.6 to 2.7 million barrels a day, according to IHS.

**Prices aren’t rising – Iraq produces for domestic use, not global use**

**Beauchamp, 14,** June 14, Zack Staff Writer, “ISIS surrounded Iraq's largest oil refinery. Why aren’t oil prices spiking?”, http://www.vox.com/2014/6/18/5821638/how-baiji-affected-oil-prices

The major news out of Iraq today is the battle over the Baiji oil refinery, a plant responsible for turning a full third of the country's crude into useful petroleum. The battle illustrates two important things about the Iraq conflict: first, don't come to quick conclusions about major developments. Second, there's a good reason the fighting hasn't yet rocked global oil markets — the Baiji refinery makes products for domestic consumption in Iraq rather than for export.¶ Different news reports have said different things about who controls Baiji. The New York Times reported that the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIS) [controlled](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/06/19/world/middleeast/iraqi-oil-refinery-ablaze-as-army-and-militants-clash.html) the refinery, but also that "other Iraqi officials, including the commander of the garrison defending the Baiji refinery, asserted that fighting was still going on." Reuters quoted an Iraqi official saying that ISIS controlled "75 percent" of the refinery: "the production units, administration building and four watch towers."¶ As of 5 pm eastern, Iraq Oil Reports, a group with sources throughout Iraq, was [reporting](https://twitter.com/iraqoilreport/status/479297374159134720) that the Iraqi government controlled the refinery, but were surrounded by rebels who controlled the territory around it. They note, however, that [different people](http://www.iraqoilreport.com/security/energy-sector/battle-baiji-refinery-yields-ongoing-stalemate-12533/) they've spoken to tell quite distinct pictures of the state of the fighting.¶ The point is that news out of Iraq right now is tentative at best. Sometimes it's because the situation is changing; other times, it's because people simply have limited ability to know what's happening in a war zone. What we hear is "not really news, it's rumors," Fanan Haddar, an Iraq expert at the National University of Singapore, told me. It's always good to be skeptical about immediate, major reports.¶ Perhaps that's part of the reason global oil markets didn't spike in response to the news out of Baiji. The Brent Crude Oil Index, a solid measure of oil prices, went up 77 cents today [in response to the Baiji news](http://in.reuters.com/article/2014/06/18/markets-oil-idINL4N0OZ19H20140618). That's not nothing, but it's hardly a panic.¶ The most important reason for the minimal reaction is that Baiji isn't important to the global oil supply. As Steven Mufson [explains](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2014/06/18/iraqs-biggest-oil-refinery-is-on-fire-how-important-is-that/), Baiji doesn't really export petroleum. It's mostly responsible for domestic supply, and largely within the areas contested by ISIS at that. Since Baiji doesn't produce for export, global markets aren't all that concerned.¶ Iraq's largest oil fields, in northeastern and southeastern Iraq, are [largely sheltered](http://www.vox.com/cards/things-about-isis-you-need-to-know/oil-market) from the fighting. But concerns about Iraq's ability to continue exporting amidst the crisis have already sent the Brent index up to its highest price since last September. So there's been a real effect on global oil prices — and a [potential for more](http://www.vox.com/2014/6/12/5805282/this-map-shows-how-violence-in-iraq-could-threaten-the-oil-supply/in/5568955).

**No spike in oil prices**

**Time, 14,** June 19, “Will the Iraqi Siege Cause Oil and Gasoline Prices to Spike?”, http://time.com/2900082/iraqi-oil-price-spike/

Should we be worried about a major spike in oil prices—and summer gas prices—because of the [sectarian conflict in Iraq](http://time.com/2899865/iraq-oil/)? It’s an important question in the markets right now, because every $10 increase in the price of oil shaves 0.5 percent of global growth. I’m cautiously optimistic for the moment that the answer will be: no.¶ Oil, as [I’ve written before](http://content.time.com/time/printout/0,8816,2056706,00.html), is amongst the most fear driven commodities. Supply and demand are supposed to rule markets, but every time there’s a major conflict in the oil rich Middle East—from the Iranian revolution to the Gulf War—prices go up about 30 percent higher than they should be, regardless of the facts on the ground. Even when supply isn’t interrupted, even when there’s plenty of oil to fuel world markets, the price of crude is typically driven by fear rather than reality.¶ So what are the facts on the ground right now in Iraq? The refinery that is currently under siege by militants is in the north and used mostly for domestic consumption. That’s not great news for Iraqis, but it has little bearing on international markets. The major oil fields that produce for the export market are in the south of the country, firmly in the hands of the government, and exports are actually increasing. The fact that big Western oil majors like BP and Exxon are pulling out staff isn’t great news, because developing countries like Iraq typically need outsider help to keep production efficient. I think it’s fair to say that if the conflict continues for months, Iraq may struggle to keep production levels high, but I don’t think we’re going to see a major supply disruption unless conflict moves South.

## Solvency

### 1NC Solvency

**Too dangerous to successfully extract AND transport**

**Kemp et al, 12,** Geoffrey Kemp and Tim Boersma are fellows at Real Clear World and Nicholas Siegel is program officer at the Transatlantic Academy in Washington, DC., 1-5-12, http://www.realclearworld.com/articles/2012/01/05/is\_geopolitical\_competition\_over\_the\_arctic\_exaggerated\_99828.html

Slowly but surely, climate change is opening up the Arctic. Greenland's glaciers and ice fields are melting, sea ice around the North Pole is decreasing each year, and the huge permafrost areas of Russia and Canada are beginning to thaw. This has led to widespread speculation of a Great Game-style scramble for the region's abundant resources. Many studies, including those by the private sector and the U.S. Geological Survey, confirm that there are vast treasure-troves of oil, gas, and minerals in the Arctic. Yet, with the exception of iron ore in Greenland, these resources have not yet been exploited. In fact, despite rising temperatures, the impediments to extracting and transporting most resources from the Arctic will remain formidable for the foreseeable future. One factor facing developers is that, despite global warming, the Arctic remains largely inhospitable, and there are innumerable obstacles to cashing in on its riches. Oil rigs require airstrips, roads, electricity generation, and pipelines; mining operations require port facilities and technology to withstand the bitterest winters; and all resource extraction requires a specialized labor force. For the private sector to develop any part of the Arctic, enormous investments of capital and labor would be necessary.

While there is a possibility that the Arctic seaways -- running through Canada and along the northern Russian coast -- will become open to transportation for most of the year, large container ships are unlikely to use these routes. The Arctic will remain a dangerous trade route for commercial shipping, and neither Canadian nor Russian authorities can offer much in the way of support and rescue facilities in the event of emergencies along their northern borders. The dangers are further evidenced by recent investments in traditional sea routes and facilities, such as the Panama Canal. By contrast, the port of Reykjavik in Iceland, which would be ideally positioned to serve as a future hub for northern sea routes, has seen no such investment. In the long run, permafrost thawing may prove to be the greatest obstacle to Arctic developers. It has made the construction of roadways and airfields much more difficult, and in some cases has caused extractive projects to be abandoned. This process has already caused enormous problems in Russia, where large cities such as Yakutsk and several large river ports, pipelines, conventional hydro electricity plants, and even a nuclear power station lie in permafrost areas. Yakutsk in particular has seen severe damage to its infrastructure and the closure of a runway of its airport as a result of the land below melting.

#### Not enough refineries

**CFAP, 08,** Center for American Progress,"Ten Reasons Not to Expand Offshore Drilling", [www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2008/09/15/4894/ten-reasons-not-to-expand-offshore-drilling/](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2008/09/15/4894/ten-reasons-not-to-expand-offshore-drilling/)

8. We can’t refine the oil we would extract. In a June speech, President George W. Bush noted that, “Refineries are the critical link between crude oil and the gasoline and diesel fuel that drivers put in their tanks.” Yet refineries are already so stretched that last year, the United States had to import almost 150 million barrels of gasoline. The Wall Street Journal reported oil companies are not building new refineries because it would be bad for their bottom line: “Building a new refinery from scratch, Exxon believes, would be bad for long-term business.”

#### Technical barriers prevent solvency

**CBO, 12**, Congressional Budget Office, August 2012, "Potential Budgetary Effects of Immediately Opening Most Federal Lands to Oil and Gas Leasing", [www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/attachments/08-09-12\_Oil-and-Gas\_Leasing.pdf](http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/attachments/08-09-12_Oil-and-Gas_Leasing.pdf)

Offshore Leasing For this analysis, CBO used EIA’s estimates of the potential for new areas to produce oil or gas after 2022. EIA expects that any initial production from newly opened areas in the Atlantic, Pacific, and eastern Gulf of Mexico would be far less than is produced by current operations in the Gulf of Mexico (see Figure 2). In its Annual Energy Outlook 2011, EIA estimated that if leasing commenced in those OCS regions by 2023, production through 2035 would amount to around 0.35 billion BOE—or about 3 percent of the 13.5 billion BOE that the agency projected would be produced from federal leases in the Gulf of Mexico over that 13-year period.17 EIA’s estimates reflect its assumption that “local infrastructure issues and other potential nonfederal impediments are resolved.”18 In CBO’s view, such factors probably would slow or limit production, as they sometimes have in the past. The federal government has spent about $1.5 billion to compensate firms for leases that were canceled or relinquished because of state or local concerns about oil and gas development off the coasts of California, North Carolina, and Florida and in Bristol Bay in Alaska.19 According to DOI, 24 localities in California have “enacted ordinances that either bar the construction of onshore support facilities for offshore oil and gas development or subject the approval of such facilities to a vote by local citizens.”20 Any development in the Atlantic OCS would involve siting and building new pipelines and related onshore facilities, which would require approval by state and local authorities. Other technical complications and economic factors add to the uncertainty surrounding forecasts of production in new areas of the OCS. DOI’s resource assessments suggest that much of the undiscovered oil in the eastern Gulf of Mexico is located in ultradeep water—water that is more than 2,400 meters (about 7,900 feet) deep—where few leases can be brought into production in any year because of the cost and complexity of their development. 21 Other factors could slow production in new areas, including the need for exploratory drilling and the expectation that most of the fields will be relatively small.22 Historically, production facilities have been installed at a slower pace in the California OCS than in the Gulf of Mexico.23

**Lack of porting sites kills solvency – too hard to build there**

**Cottrell, 13,** Paula, Alaska Business Monthly, “Arctic Infrastructure Needed for Resource Development and Delivery,” January, http://www.akbizmag.com/Alaska-Business-Monthly/January-2013/Arctic-Infrastructure-Needed-for-Resource-Development-and-Delivery

“Arctic development is going to require ports and infrastructure statewide,” says Sen. Mark Begich. “Development on this scale will have substantial impacts on Arctic communities and the whole state.”¶ This infrastructure—airports, roads, ports, pipelines and facilities—presents some unique challenges in the Arctic. “There is a lot of shallow water along the Arctic coastline,” says Henry Huntington, Arctic science director of Pew Environment Group, a nonprofit organization that works to establish science-based policies. “This presents some serious limitations on what kind of vessels can be used.”¶ Deepwater ports, while clearly a necessity, aren’t ideally suited for the soft shorelines in the Arctic, he says. “There are no areas along the Arctic Coast that are suitable for a real harbor or port,” says Huntington. “Everything is exposed and shallow.”

**Arctic oil is too hard to process**

**Klare, 12,** Michael T. Klare. Author and Professor of Peace and World-Security Studies, Hampshire College. Why Twenty-First Century Oil Will Break the Bank -- and the Planet. 03/13/12. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-t-klare/obama-gas-prices\_b\_1342042.html?ref=green

Oil prices are now higher than they have ever been -- except for a few frenzied moments before the global economic meltdown of 2008. Many immediate factors are contributing to this surge, including Iran’s threats to block oil shipping in the Persian Gulf, fears of a new Middle Eastern war, and turmoil in energy-rich Nigeria. Some of these pressures could ease in the months ahead, providing temporary relief at the gas pump. But the principal cause of higher prices -- a fundamental shift in the structure of the oil industry -- cannot be reversed, and so oil prices are destined to remain high for a long time to come. In energy terms, we are now entering a world whose grim nature has yet to be fully grasped. This pivotal shift has been brought about by the disappearance of relatively accessible and inexpensive petroleum -- “easy oil,” in the parlance of industry analysts; in other words, the kind of oil that powered a staggering expansion of global wealth over the past 65 years and the creation of endless car-oriented suburban communities. This oil is now nearly gone. The world still harbors large reserves of petroleum, but these are of the hard-to-reach, hard-to-refine, “tough oil” variety. From now on, every barrel we consume will be more costly to extract, more costly to refine -- and so more expensive at the gas pump. Those who claim that the world remains “awash” in oil are technically correct: the planet still harbors vast reserves of petroleum. But propagandists for the oil industry usually fail to emphasize that not all oil reservoirs are alike: some are located close to the surface or near to shore, and are contained in soft, porous rock; others are located deep underground, far offshore, or trapped in unyielding rock formations. The former sites are relatively easy to exploit and yield a liquid fuel that can readily be refined into usable liquids; the latter can only be exploited through costly, environmentally hazardous techniques, and often result in a product which must be heavily processed before refining can even begin. The simple truth of the matter is this: most of the world’s easy reserves have already been depleted -- except for those in war-torn countries like Iraq. Virtually all of the oil that’s left is contained in harder-to-reach, tougher reserves. These include deep-offshore oil, Arctic oil, and shale oil, along with Canadian “oil sands” -- which are not composed of oil at all, but of mud, sand, and tar-like bitumen. So-called unconventional reserves of these types can be exploited, but often at a staggering price, not just in dollars but also in damage to the environment. In the oil business, this reality was first acknowledged by the chairman and CEO of Chevron, David O’Reilly, in a 2005 letter published in many American newspapers. “One thing is clear,” he wrote, “the era of easy oil is over.” Not only were many existing oil fields in decline, he noted, but “new energy discoveries are mainly occurring in places where resources are difficult to extract, physically, economically, and even politically.” Further evidence for this shift was provided by the International Energy Agency (IEA) in a 2010 review of world oil prospects. In preparation for its report, the agency examined historic yields at the world’s largest producing fields -- the “easy oil” on which the world still relies for the overwhelming bulk of its energy. The results were astonishing: those fields were expected to lose three-quarters of their productive capacity over the next 25 years, eliminating 52 million barrels per day from the world’s oil supplies, or about 75 percent of current world crude oil output. The implications were staggering: either find new oil to replace those 52 million barrels or the Age of Petroleum will soon draw to a close and the world economy would collapse. Of course, as the IEA made clear back in 2010, there will be new oil, but only of the tough variety that will exact a price from us all -- and from the planet, too. To grasp the implications of our growing reliance on tough oil, it’s worth taking a whirlwind tour of some of the more hair-raising and easily damaged spots on Earth. So fasten your seatbelts: first we’re heading out to sea -- way, way out -- to survey the “promising” new world of twenty-first-century oil.

**High maintenance costs, erosion, weather, lack of daylight kill drilling**

**DoD, 11,** US Department of Defense, “Report to Congress on Arctic Operations and the Northwest Passage”; < http://www.defense.gov/pubs/pdfs/Tab\_A\_Arctic\_Report\_Public.pdf

Because of the range and severity of Arctic conditions, climatic, hydrologic, topographic, and geographic factors must all be considered in site selection for any infrastructure in this region. The environment desired inside buildings is usually drastically different from ambient conditions, placing additional stresses on building components. Some important considerations for infrastructure in the Arctic include: **condensation control, structural design ventilation, snow load, snow accumulation and drifting potential, and roof drainage,** among others detailed in the Unified Facilities Criteria manuals.17 When infrastructure is sited along the coast, erosion, silting, sea ice variability, and coastal dynamics must also be considered. The ice movement means that conventional pier construction is rarely feasible. An additional consideration is the months of **almost continuous daylight in summer**, **followed by winter** months of almost **complete darkness**, a variation that becomes **more extreme as one goes further north**. **Construction in the Arctic is seasonal and skilled labor is usually in short supply; therefore, costs for both construction and maintenance are high.** The need to provide room and board at remote locations, **decreased efficiency of workers and machinery in extreme environmental conditions, and the difficulties, costs, and risks** **in shipping materials** and equipment add to the challenge. Because of the short construction season, outside work must be accomplished quickly, dictating a high degree of expensive prefabricated construction. During ice-free periods, the most economical means of transportation is by barge. During the winter, transportation over frozen rivers and lakes may be more economical than air transportation. But delays in shipping equipment due to weather can result in prolonged construction times and expensive emergency air freight costs. Construction in the Arctic costs, as a rule of thumb, three to five times more than comparable infrastructure in lower latitudes. Another challenge to bear in mind is the risk to existing infrastructure posed by thawing permafrost. As the permafrost thaws, it loses strength and volume, leading to failure of foundations and piling. The warming climate will also accelerate the erosion of shorelines and riverbanks, threatening infrastructure located on eroding shorelines.

**Lack of a workforce prevents solvency**

**Block and Brady, 12,** Melissa and Jeff, NPR staff writers,"Booming Oil Industry Struggles To Fill Jobs," 5-9-12, www.npr.org/2012/05/09/152366886/booming-oil-industry-struggles-to-fill-jobs

The oil industry **can't find enough** new **workers** to replace an aging workforce. Recruiters are busy finding a new generation of workers and training programs have sprung up to prepare them. Some young people are signing on for jobs that promise good pay — but there are still a lot of positions to fill. It's ALL THINGS CONSIDERED from NPR News. I'm Audie Cornish. MELISSA BLOCK, HOST: And I'm Melissa Block. The unemployment rate here in the U.S. is high, above eight percent. But at least one industry insists it can't find and hire experienced workers fast enough. Thousands of older employees are beginning to retire from the oil and gas industry. And as NPR's Jeff Brady reports, the shortage comes at the very moment high oil prices have companies hoping to drill more. JEFF BRADY, BYLINE: Look across the oil fields in the U.S. and offshore and you'll see a lot more gray hair than just a few decades back. A hiring lull during the 1980s oil bust has left a **generation gap**. JIM NOE: We've struggled, as an industry, to attract young workers and I think there's a lot of reasons for that. BRADY: Jim Noe is senior vice president at Hercules Offshore in Houston. He suspects one reason is job security. The oil business is cyclical and companies tend to layoff workers when prices decline. But Noe says there are big pluses that come with an oil industry job; there's travel and, given the current worker shortage, good pay. NOE: Straight out of high school, no skills, we pay you $55,000 a year with full benefits, 401k, health care coverage, et cetera. And we're still struggling to attract workers here at Hercules. BRADY: Fifty-five thousand dollars a year would be attractive even to college students facing a difficult job market after they graduate. (SOUNDBITE OF MACHINERY) BRADY: But talk to Temple University students on the street in Philadelphia and you'll learn the oil industry's recruiting problems **run deeper** than just job security and pay. Nick Nothaft is a freshman studying linguistics. She says environmental concerns and high gas prices have given the industry a bad reputation. NICK NOTHAFT: I just don't imagine myself working for that industry. I don't have a good impression of it, I would say. And it just doesn't seem like something that would be attractive to me. BRADY: Down the street, junior Dashiell Sears is studying political science and would like to work for a politician in the future. He thinks having big oil on his resume could jeopardize that. DASHIELL SEARS: If I was going to out for this very, I'll say, liberal office I want to work for them and I have ExxonMobil on there and I worked on their PR and they're taking all these subsidies that they're totally against, it doesn't work toward me.

**That means zero risk of the aff**

**IMCA, 07,** International Marine Contractors Association, "Tackling the Skills Shortage," Oil and Gas, Issue 7, www.cisoilgas.com/article/Tackling-the-skills-shortage/

Getting to grips with the lack of highly skilled oil and gas workers is a matter of urgency for the industry. Hugh Williams, Chief Executive of the International Marine Contractors Association (IMCA), explains how his organization is taking a proactive approach to the problem. Economic growth is the aim of every country eager to improve its general well being. It ensures the future, is the lifeblood of the market sector, boosts the expansion of companies and thus encourages their employees. Fortunately, the marine contracting industry is currently thriving and can look forward to its workload remaining at a very high level for some time to come. On the face of it, this is good news for our industry but, as everyone is fully aware, success rarely happens without causing some problems. The **major challenge** facing our industry at this time is a serious skills shortage. In other words, we are perilously short of the **most important commodity** of all– **people**. The industry is extremely busy and expects to remain so for a number of years. Many companies are experiencing challenges in recruiting sufficiently trained and skilled personnel for their projects all over the world. **This is placing** **significant pressure on their** growth and **ability to deliver services**. As the international trade association representing over 350 offshore, marine and underwater engineering companies in 45 countries, the IMCA is eager to help its members address this skills shortage. Our members are involved in many aspects of offshore marine contracting, including pipe-laying, heavy lifting, diving, remotely operated vehicles (ROV) operations and offshore surveying – largely carried out from dynamically positioned (DP) vessels, as well as other marine operations, offshore supply and support of many other kinds. At the start of this year, we focused attention on the skills shortage by highlighting the projected numbers of trained personnel required by the expanding marine contracting industry over the next 2-3 years. Our members have provided some practical estimates of the possible growth of their businesses – for example, orders for new build construction vessels, drilling rigs, saturation diving spreads and remotely operated vehicles. From these estimates we are able to extrapolate some of the marine contracting industry’s recruitment needs over the next few years; the new tonnage needs to be manned and supported by highly skilled professionals in order to meet the stringent requirements of the market with regard to both execution and safety. The figures thrown up by the industry certainly make for interesting and compelling reading (see boxout: Big numbers), and these numbers do not include the large numbers of additional air diving personnel and the many other deck, catering and ancillary crew, or onshore and engineering support personnel required to operate the vessels. Just looking ahead a couple of years, the figures pose a serious challenge to an industry already finding it difficult to recruit, train and retain skilled personnel. For example, the worldwide diving schools can perhaps train about 100 new saturation divers a year. That there is a ‘skills shortage’ is widely acknowledged. By providing firm, verifiable estimates of anticipated growth, we are highlighting the seriousness and complexity of the challenge faced, not only by IMCA members worldwide, but also by all stakeholders in the offshore oil industry. Indeed, the future **health and** **growth** of a number of industries, not just the oil and gas industry, may be **directly affected** by a shortage of trained personnel in the coming years.

**Takes decades to solve**

**Brady, 12,** Jeff NPR National Desk Correspondent covering energy issues"As Workers Age, Oil Industry Braces For Skills Gap," NPR, 4-20-12, www.npr.org/2012/04/20/150871935/as-workers-age-oil-industry-braces-for-skills-gap

Konrad says such staffing reorganizations are becoming more common. Around the globe, as more huge drill ships like the Deepwater Horizon are built to take advantage of high oil prices, companies have had difficulty finding enough experienced workers. "It only takes a year to build a billion-dollar ship," Konrad says. "But it takes **10**, **20**, **30** **years** to build a billion-dollar captain who's going to navigate and command the ship." And just as demand for more experienced workers is rising, their numbers are declining. A survey by Schlumberger Business Consulting finds that **22,000** experienced geoscientists and engineers will leave the field by 2015.

### 2NC Solvency

#### It’s decades until production starts

Murawski 12 (John, "Opening Atlantic Ocean to offshore drilling likely," 10-2, http://www.newsobserver.com/2012/10/02/2384560/opening-atlantic-ocean-to-offshore.html#storylink=cpy)

But even if the Atlantic Ocean is opened to energy companies, oil and gas production would likely not get underway for at least a decade. The energy exploration cycle is heavily regulated and requires seismic testing, environmental assessments, oceanographic mapping, military reviews and other regulatory hurdles before any oil and gas can start flowing. “There’s no way to speed this up,” said Athan Manuel, director of the Sierra Club’s lands protection program. The latest federal estimates from the U.S. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management for the entire Atlantic coast is between 11 trillion cubic feet and 54 trillion cubic feet of natural gas – well below the 84.2 trillion cubic feet found in the Marcellus Shale that spans New York and Pennsylvania. The amount of oil is likely between 1.3 billion barrels and 5.58 billion barrels, less than a year’s supply. With the market price of gas hovering near all-time lows, the Energy Information Administration, a division within the U.S. Department of Energy, has estimated that no oil or gas will be produced in the Atlantic or outer continental shelf before 2035. Drilling offshore could begin 3 miles beyond the coast, the point at which federal waters begin, extending as far as 200 miles in the ocean. Each mile away from land increases the cost of pipelines, land-to-rig travel and drilling in ever-deeper waters. $66M to $400M a year Beyond the engineering and technical challenges, offshore drilling would mobilize state governments to press Congress to change federal law to allow states to collect royalties on the lease fees, as is done for Gulf Coast states. North Carolina could collect $66 million to $400 million a year for the life of the reserves, according to a 145-page report issued September 2011 by a scientific advisory panel created by Gov. Perdue. The revenue amount, at the top end, could approach 2 percent of the state’s $20.2 billion annual budget. “You could scatter that money around all over state government,” said Weatherspoon of the N.C. Petroleum Council. He said the money could bolster programs such as environmental regulation, mental health services, community colleges and others that have been hard-hit by budget cuts. Weatherspoon said that offshore exploration would pit neighboring states against each other to host shore bases that would supply and support the offshore rigs. Such bases could involve hundreds of jobs in metallurgy, food preparation, transportation and related work. A 2009 report from the Southeast Energy Alliance, an industry trade group, estimated that offshore drilling could create 6,700 new jobs in North Carolina. Bill Holman, director of the State Policy Program at Duke University’s Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions, said chances are slim that North Carolina could compete with larger ports in South Carolina and Virginia. Holman based his assessment on his tenure as a member of another offshore study panel, the Legislative Research Commission’s Advisory Subcommittee on Offshore Energy Exploration, which prepared a report in 2010. He said little research has been done on offshore resources, and noted that projected natural gas prices suggest that little will change in this regard in the near future. “We’re at the same state of knowledge on these issues as we were 20 years ago,” Holman said. “Until the price of natural gas goes way up, I’d be surprised if there would be very much interest, given the cost of developing those offshore resources versus the cost of developing the known resources.”

#### No effect until after 2020 and it’s a tiny amount then – most is available already

Newell 11 (Richard Newell, the Gendell Associate Professor of Energy and Environmental Economics at the Nicholas School at Duke and the head of the U.S Energy Information Administration, 3-17-11, “STATEMENT OF RICHARD NEWELL ADMINISTRATOR ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY before the COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,” <http://www.eia.gov/neic/speeches/newell_03172011.pdf#page=7>)

Access to offshore federal resources. As of January 2009, the mean estimate of technically ¶ recoverable crude oil resources located in Federal offshore areas of the lower-48 states is 64.1 ¶ billion barrels. Of this amount, 3.7 billion barrels are estimated to exist in the Eastern/Central ¶ Gulf of Mexico region that is still under a Federal leasing moratorium.¶ 1¶ In addition, the mean ¶ estimate of technically recoverable resources of crude oil located in the Alaska OCS area is 26.6¶ billion barrels. Note that these and other technically recoverable resource estimates provided ¶ here tend to be higher than resource estimates from the USGS because the USGS estimates only ¶ include undiscovered resources, where as the EIA estimates used for modeling purposes also ¶ include proved reserves, inferred reserves, and undiscovered resources in areas not yet assessed ¶ by the USGS. In addition, the resource estimates provided here do not reflect recent downward ¶ revisions by USGS to resource estimates for the National Petroleum Reserve Alaska.¶ 2¶ From the above, it is evident that the Eastern/Central Gulf oil resources now subject to a formal ¶ leasing moratorium represent only a small part of the Federal OCS. Even if the moratorium that ¶ restricts leasing in this region were to be lifted, lags associated with the awarding of new Federal ¶ offshore leases and with the exploration and development of such leases suggest that production ¶ would be unlikely to occur until after 2020.¶ Given that OCS areas not under any leasing moratorium are estimated to account for over 95 ¶ percent of the total mean estimate of technically recoverable OCS resources, perhaps the most ¶ significant Federal OCS development issues relate to those areas that are already open to Federal ¶ oil and gas leasing. One such issue revolves around when newly available offshore areas, ¶ particularly in the Pacific and Atlantic, will be made available to oil and gas producers in future ¶ Federal lease sales. Areas where OCS leasing has been available for many years—including the ¶ Western Gulf, most of the Central Gulf, and Alaska—hold the vast majority of estimated ¶ technically recoverable OCS oil resources. The AEO2011 generally assumes that both leasing ¶ and regulatory approvals in areas where OCS leasing has been available for many years will ¶ proceed in a manner that supports their continued major contribution to overall U.S. oil ¶ production. Were leasing and/or regulatory processes to slow or speed up significantly, ¶ projected OCS production could be reduced or increased from the level of 1.5 to 2 million ¶ barrels per day that is projected in the 2014 though 2035 period in the AEO2011 Reference case.

#### No drilling equipment

CFAP 8 (Center for American Progress, 9/15/2008, "Ten Reasons Not to Expand Offshore Drilling", [www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2008/09/15/4894/ten-reasons-not-to-expand-offshore-drilling/](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2008/09/15/4894/ten-reasons-not-to-expand-offshore-drilling/))

7. There isn’t enough drilling equipment. Due to the high price of oil, existing drilling ships are “booked solid for the next five years,” and demand for deepwater rigs has driven up the price of such ships. Oil companies just don’t have the resources to explore oil fields in the OCS.